A REVIEW OF THE CONTROVERSY About the MEANING of *DEMONIACKS* IN THE NEW-TESTAMENT.

IN WHICH

Mr. HUTCHINSON's Sermon at *Oxford*, about the uſual Interpretation of ΔΑΙΜΟΝΕΣ,

The REPLY to the FURTHER ENQUIRY,

Mr. TWELLS's ANSWER to the FURTHER ENQUIRY. And

A TRACT, entitled, *Some Thoughts on the Miracles of JESUS*, by an IMPARTIAL HAND,

Are CONSIDER'D.

† By a Lover of *TRUTH*.

I am perſuaded, 'till I ſhall hear better Reaſons to the contrary, that theſe DEMONIACKS *were* no other *than ſuch as we call* Madmen *and* Lunaticks; *at leaſt that we comprehend them under theſe Names. — The Cauſe of which our Miſtake is that Diſguiſe of another* Name *and* Notion *than we conceive them by; which makes us take them to be* diverſe *which are indeed the* ſame.

MEDE's *Diſcourſe upon* John x. 20.

LONDON:
Printed for J. ROBERTS, in *Warwick-Lane*. 1739.
[Price *One Shilling*.]

† by Mr Gregory Sharpe afterwards Master of the Temple

Sharpe, Gregory

A REVIEW OF THE CONTROVERSY About the Meaning of *DEMONIACKS* IN THE NEW-TESTAMENT.

EVERY *fair* and *rational* Enquirer into the *Grounds*, and Truth of *Chriſtianity* has a juſt Right to have his *Difficulties* ſatisfied, and his *Doubts* removed, by thoſe *that know and believe the Truth.* If *Errors* are imputed to the *Goſpel*, it is

the Duty of its *Profeſſors*, to vindicate themſelves and their Religion againſt the Charge of Falſhood or Deceit; to ſet the *Scriptures* in their natural and cleareſt Light; to expoſe *received Opinions*, if blameable or groundleſs; and to defend the *Truth* by *Truth*, which alone is able to ſupport *itſelf*. Idle and *ridiculous* Notions, blended with the true Religion, will not be of any Service to the Cauſe of Chriſt, but render it *contemptible* to *Unbelievers*, who have *Eyes* to ſee our *Weakneſs*, and *Hands* ready to expoſe us.

He therefore who attempts to clear *Chriſtianity* from any, even the leaſt Obſtacle that attends it, and is deſirous to repreſent it pure, and in its native Luſtre, to the Minds of Men, ſhews a *true Zeal* and Concern for the Cauſe of Chriſt, and merits the ſincere Thanks of honeſt Searchers after Truth, and of all *impartial Hands*.

Few who have *thought* on the Meaning of *Demoniacks*, have looked upon this Subject as *free* from *Difficulties*, or, as attended with ſuch Difficulties only, which are " as little * Things, of no Weight " with thinking Men, but as light as Va- " nity itſelf, and not ſeldom perhaps the

* *Some Thoughts*, &c. p. 52.

" Off-

" Offspring thereof." — The great Mr. *Mede* was plainly of different Sentiments from this *Author*, when he thus expreſſed himſelf in his Fourth *Diſcourſe* upon *John* x. 20.

" I MAKE *no* Queſtion but now and then " the ſame befalls other Men whereof I " have Experience myſelf, *to wit*, to mar- " vel how theſe *Demoniacks* ſhould ſo " abound in *that* Nation, which was the " People of God; (whereas in *other* Na- " tions and their *Writings* we hear of *no* " *ſuch*;) and that too, as it ſhould ſeem, " about the *Time* of our Saviour's being " on Earth *only*; becauſe in the Time *be-* " *fore* we find *no* Mention of them *in* " *Scripture*. The *Wonder* is yet the " *greater*, becauſe it ſeems, notwithſtand- " ing all this, by the Story of the Goſpel, " not to have been accounted by the People " of the *Jews* any ſtrange or extraordinary " Thing, but as a Matter uſual; nor be- " ſides is taken *Notice* of by *any foreign* " Story. To meet with *all theſe Dif-* " *ficulties*, (which I ſee not how *other-* " *wiſe* can be *eaſily* ſatisfied) I am per- " ſwaded, ('till I ſhall hear *better* Rea- " ſons to the contrary,) that theſe *De-* " *moniacks* were *no other* than ſuch as we " call *Mad-men* and *Lunaticks*, at leaſt " that we comprehend them under thoſe " Names;

" Names; and that therefore they both " *ſtill* are, and in *all Times* and *Places* " have been, much more frequent than " we imagine. The Cauſe of which our " Miſtake, is that Diſguiſe of another " *Name* and *Notion* than we conceive " them by; which makes us take them " to be *diverſe*, which are the *ſame*."

I SHOULD not have given my Reader this long Citation from that *excellent Writer*, but that, I think, it contains the Foundations of the *Enquirer's* Scheme; and plainly ſhews him not to be guilty of *Innovations*, *Novelty*, *Heterodoxy*, or of any *frightful Opinions*; " * of *undermi-* " *ning* his Maſter's *Intereſt*, or of *pluck-* " *ing* the *Laurels*, the never-fading *Lau-* " *rels*, from his Head; *Laurels* which, " *&c.*"

DOES this *Impartial Writer* think, that the *Difficulties*, enumerated by Mr. *Mede*, " are of *no* Weight, but as light " as Vanity itſelf?" Does he think that " Vanity is the Author thereof?" And will he not allow Mr. *Mede* to have been a " thinking Man?" Or will not the unjuſt Cenſures here thrown upon the *Enquirer*, unavoidably reflect on Mr. *Mede*? Thus (*p.* 68) — That he has removed a

* *Some Thoughts*, &c. p. 68.

Pegg

Pegg from the Chriſtian Edifice :—(*p.* 45.) "That whatever his Friends may ſay in "Defence of *his Sincerity*, ſure I am, his "*Judgment* muſt be given up by them as "*utterly indefenſible*:"—(*p.* 50.) "That "what, in this Caſe, he has offered to "the Publick, one would hardly think, "could be the *real* Sentiments of a *grave* "or *ſerious* Writer."—And (*p.* 60) "after he has ſaid this and much more to "the ſame Purpoſe, in the *ſame careleſs* "*Manner*, he goes on."— Are theſe Expreſſions fit or becoming an *Impartial Hand?* Do they not as much reflect on the great Mr. *Mede*, as on the *Enquirer*? And does this Author really think, that either of thoſe Gentlemen deſigned by their Writings a *Removal* of *the leaſt Pegg* in the Chriſtian Edifice?

THE *Enquirer*, who was juſtly ſenſible of the Difficulties that attend the common and *received Notion* of *Demoniacks* in the *New Teſtament*, modeſtly propoſes to the World a Scheme to remove theſe Difficulties, and the Prejudices that from them ſome may have againſt the Goſpel itſelf; nor does he advance one Step, without producing his Evidence from the beſt Writers in Antiquity. And he has ſhewn, that there is no Occaſion to ſuppoſe a Multitude of *powerful* and *miſ-*

chievous

chievous Devils, ſent to poſſeſs and cruelly torment weak Men; ſince ſuch Beings are no where to be met with in the *Old Teſtament*; and perhaps the Word, *Demons*, in the plural Number, is not uſed, in all Antiquity, before the Coming of *Chriſt*, to ſignify the ſame as Devils. In the Goſpel, theſe Beings are not ſtiled *Devils*, but *Demons*; (Δαίμονες) and *Demon* is a Word which the *Antients* never uſed in the Senſe of a *malevolent Being*, unleſs it be of *Arimanius*, one of the *Chaldean* firſt Principles, who being eſteemed by them an *Original* and *Independent* Cauſe, is a Caſe quite foreign to the Purpoſe: for the Diſpute is not concerning *Original* or firſt Cauſes, but *inferior*, *dependent Beings*, or *Demons*. *Plato*, in his *Cratylus*, repreſents them as δαίμονες ϗ φρόνιμοι, *knowing and wiſe Beings*: *Heſiod* calls them "good "Beings, the Guardians of mortal "Men." —

Ἐσθλοὶ, ἐπιχθόνιοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.

Not only the *Poets*, but alſo the *Philoſophers*, accounted *Demons good* and *juſt* Beings, the *Miniſters* of Heaven, and *Executors* of Divine Juſtice upon Men. This was the Language of the Times when our *Saviour* came, and his *Diſciples* wrote; whoſe Buſineſs it was to reform

form Men's Manners, not to reform Language, nor to uſe Words to a Purpoſe they were never uſed before. For no one Inſtance, I believe, can be produced from ancient Authors, to ſhew that *Demons*, before the Coming of Chriſt, ſignify'd Devils, or malicious Beings, malevolent, hurtful to Mankind, delighting in promoting Wickedneſs.

THIS is the *Enquirer*'s Account of *Demons*, and this his Adverſary ſhould have conſidered, and if falſe oppoſed: But the *Impartial Hand* not only avoids it; not only pays no Regard to the *genuine* Senſe of the Word *Demon*; not only produces no Authorities from ancient Writers againſt the *Enquirer:* but, almoſt in every Page, *Demons* are called *Devils*; and the *great Devil*'s Exiſtence is defended, whoſe Being the Enquirer no where denies. — " * It may be ſeen from hence " what a Man will do for the Sake of an " Hypotheſis."

BUT what the *Impartial Hand* has neglected, may be deem'd ſufficiently made up by the Care of Others. The Author of the *Reply to the Further Enquiry*, has attempted to ſhew the Sentiments of the Ancients concerning *Evil Demons*. He imagines that the *Chaldean Good and Evil De-*

* *Some Thoughts*, p. 17.

mon may be to his Purpoſe, as they are cited by the *Enquirer* from *Laertius*. As if a firſt Principle, One, the Cauſe of Evil, had any Thing to do with *Evil Demons*, malignant Beings, that are the Subjects of the preſent Debate. His Buſineſs was to produce from Writers, *before Chriſt*, Paſſages, which proved that there was a Notion of *Evil Demons*, or what we call now, *Devils*. But inſtead of ſuch, he produces a *ſuppoſed* Saying of One in *Plutarch*, which does not ſo much as imply that the Author had ever heard of *malevolent Beings*, promoting Wickedneſs, or Miſery, amongſt Men.

THEN he cites "*Julius Pollux*, who "expreſly diſtinguiſhes *Demons* into two "Kinds: the one which he calls ἀλεξικα-"κοι, the Depellers of Evil; and the o-"ther ἀλιτήριοι, *wicked* or pernicious." *Ibid.* p. 24.

Julius Pollux, who lived One hundred Years *after* Chriſt, is ſpeaking concerning *Demons* who preſide over Curſes: "Such "ſays he, as preſerve Men from Curſes, "are called Depellers of Evil, *&c.* But "ſuch as confirm and bring about Impreca-"tions are called ἀλιτήριοι, pernicious, [not "*wicked*] deſtructive Beings, to whom "we ought to apply ourſelves in order to "get them to avert Miſchief, the Puniſhers

"of

" of thoſe who are guilty of Blood." How does this prove that the Heathen had a Notion of Devils, immoral, malignant Beings? As if every Being that deſtroys, puniſhes, executes God's Judgments upon Mankind, were a Devil. Was not the *Angel* that deſtroyed the *Aſſyrian* Army properly, ἀλιτήριος, *pernicious, deſtructive?*

THAT which may ſeem to be moſt to this Author's Point, is a Paſſage which he produces from the Preface to *Zaleucus*'s Laws in *Stobæus*. He cites it thus, " *Should* " *any one be tempted to Injuſtice by* a " wicked Demon, — *he ought to beg the* " Gods *to aſſiſt him in driving* HIM *away.* Ibid.

BUT it is a great Miſtake to tranſlate this Paſſage, as if one of many Evil *Demons* tempting Men to Injuſtice, were here intended. *Zaleucus* was a *Pythagorean*, and he embraced the *Pythagorean* Notion of the Origin of Evil. He is not therefore, 1ſt, ſpeaking concerning *a wicked Demon*, but *the* wicked *Demon*, the Origin and Cauſe of all Evil. And, 2dly, the Paſſage itſelf is miſrepreſented: This Writer renders it thus; *he ought to beg the Gods to aſſiſt him in driving* HIM *away.* Did *Zaleucus* here ſpeak of driving *the wicked* Demon *away*? Not a Word: But to drive *Injuſtice* away. The whole

Sentence is, " If the wicked *Demon* be " preſent tempting to Injuſtice, the Man " ſhould reſort to the Temples, Altars, " and Houſes of the Gods, flying from " Injuſtice as the ſevereſt and cruelleſt " Miſtreſs, and ſhould beg the Gods to " aſſiſt him in driving *it*, [not *him*, it is " αὐτὴν, not αὐτὸν] away. He ſhould go " to Men that have a Reputation of Vir- " tue, and hear them concerning a Hap- " py Life," *&c.*

THIS κακὸς Δαίμων, or Origin of Evil, is what is called in *Pindar*, abſolutely ἕτερος δαίμων, *The other* Demon. Thus in his *Pythia*, *Ode* 3.

Δαίμων δ' ἕτερος
ἐς κακὸν τρέψας ἐδαμά-
σατο νιν, καὶ γειτόνων
πολλοὶ ἐπαύρον ἁμᾷ
δ' ἔφθαρεν πολλάν τ' ὄρει πῦρ ἐξ
ἑνὸς
σπέρματος ἔνθορον αἴσασεν ὕ-
λαν.

Pindar, who was a *Pythagorean*, as *Clemens Alex.* tells us, *Str.* vth. does not mean here, what he elſewhere calls Δαίμων γενέθλιος, *the* Demon *that attends a Man from his Birth*, but the *Demon* that was the *Cauſe of all Evil.* " This " *Demon*, the firſt Principle of Evil, was " the

" the Cauſe of Evil to *Coronis*, and to all " her Neighbours." The Ancients did indeed aſſign to every Man *a Demon*, as his Guardian Angel. *Menander* ſays,

Ἅπαντι δαίμων ἀνδρὶ συμπαρίσταται
Εὐθὺς γενομένῳ μυσταγωγὸς τοῦ βίου

And ſuch *Demon* was called Δαίμων γενεθλιὸς by *Pindar*, *Olymp.* Ode xiii. By *Euripides*, theſe Beings are called θεοὶ γενέται. *Jon.* v. 1130. In none of theſe or others that I recollect is mention made of an *Evil Demon* attending any one, and prompting him to Evil. *Homer* ſays — παρὰ γὰρ θεοί εἰσι καὶ ἡμῖν, Il. 3, 440. And in his *Odyſſee*, he ſpeaks of ſome of the Immortal Gods that preſerve and protect Men:

Ἀθανάτων, ὅς τις σε φυλάσσει τε ῥύεταί τε.
Ody. ὁ. v. 34.

Perhaps *Andromache* in *Euripides* may be imagined by ſome to ſpeak of an *Evil Genius*, when ſhe ſays, That *ſhe has no one Thing to comfort her, but many that ſhe may complain of*; — Hector *kill'd, and her hard Demon, to whom ſhe was conjoin'd.*

Σπαρτοῦ τε τὸν ἐμὸν δαίμονα ᾧ συνέζυγην.
Andro. v. 98.

But by this ſhe means no more than her *cruel*

cruel hard Fortune which ever attended her: For the Rule among the Ancients, was not to impute Evil to evil Demons or Devils, of which they knew nothing, but to the Juſtice of the Gods; and they made no Scruple to ſay, as *Euripides* makes *Iphigenia*, *I cannot think any of the Demons to be Evil.*

Οὐδένα γὰρ οἶμαι δαιμόνων εἶναι κακόν.
Iphig. in *Taur.* v. 391.

They did not ſuppoſe malicious, malevolent, immoral Beings, to be the Authors of Evil or Wickedneſs in Man: Nor were the Executors of juſt Puniſhment upon Sinners, ſuch as *Tiſiphone*, or the Furies, deem'd *Devils*, or *malevolent Beings*; any more than God himſelf would be, for inflicting Puniſhments, Diſeaſes, or Death, on any Creatures that deſerve them. *Ariſtophanes* ſays,

Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ ΘΕΟΣ αἴτιός μοι τῶν κακῶν.
Nubes, v. 85.

This God's *the Cauſe of my Misfortunes*; ſpeaking of *Neptune.*

I MENTIONED *Pindar* juſt now, as meaning by the Words ἕτερος δαίμων, *the Other Demon*, the Principle or firſt Cauſe of Evil; in this, following the *Pythagorean* Syſtem. *Callimachus* has uſed the ſame

ſame Expreſſion; and means not an Evil Genius, or one of a malignant Species, ſuch as we now-a-days call *Devils*, but the firſt Cauſe of Evil; what by the *Chaldeans* is called *Arimanius*.

Οὐ πάντες, ἀλλ' οὓς ἔχεν ἕτερος δαίμων.

WHEN that Apparition came to *Brutus* in his Tent, and ſaid, *I am thine* Evil Genius, κακὸς Δαίμων, it did not mean a *Devil*, a malevolent Promoter of Wickedneſs, but a *Demon* that was to him κακὸς, *adverſe*, if there be ſufficient Evidence of the Truth of the Story. Nor were *Anthony*'s, nor *Cæſar*'s *Demons*, Beings that delighted in producing Miſery to them, but Good Beings, tho' not of equal Power or Strength.

I MUST next examine what the Rev. Mr. *Hutchinſon* has aſſerted in a Sermon preach'd before the Univerſity of *Oxford*, wherein he maintains the uſual Interpretation of δαίμονες & δαιμόνια in the New Teſtament. His Notion is, that "they "are malevolent and maleficent Beings, "delighting (or ſeeming at leaſt delight-"ed) in the Indulgence of cruel Inclina-"tions, in promoting Wickedneſs, Im-"poſture, and Miſery, amongſt Men." *p.* 10.

THE

THE Difference betwixt Mr. *Hutchinſon* and the *Enquirer* would ſoon be at an End, had he produced Authorities antienter than the New Teſtament for the Uſe of the Word δαίμων in the Senſe he underſtands it. But with all the Pomp of References that his Margins are ſtuff'd with, there is not ſo much as one that is as antient as the New Teſtament, that is to his Purpoſe. The Thing required is, to produce an Inſtance of the Word Δαίμονες ſignifying " malevolent, maleficent " Beings, delighting or delighted in pro- " moting Wickedneſs amongſt Men." For this Senſe he cites *Plutarch*, *Porphyry*, *Iamblicus*; all Good Writers, but too modern by much for the Thing to be proved. 'Tis not denied, that *after* the New Teſtament Times, that Word was uſed in an ill Senſe; and the modern *Platoniſts*, and Others, are full of ſuch a Notion. But when the Word was never uſed for *malevolent* Beings, 'till ſuch a Time at leaſt; and then we find it uſed often in a certain Book, and no Intimation is given of its ſignifying in that Book *malevolent Beings*, *delighting in promoting Wickedneſs*; what Neceſſity is there in that Book ſo to underſtand it?

YES, but *Plato* is produced as " mak- " ing the moſt pernicious Deluſions the " fa-

" favourite Employment of δαίμονες" Does *Plato* ever ſay ſo, *directly and in Terms*? No: But " when they pronounce " them the Inventors and Encouragers " of ſuch Practices, as are moſt injurious " both to Individuals and to Communi- " ties of Men; they muſt, by neceſſary " Conſequence from their own Reaſoning " about the Deity, *be preſumed* to look " upon δαίμονες as extremely evil." I ask then, Where does *Plato* pronounce Demons to be " the *Inventors* and En- " couragers of pernicious Deluſions?" Mr. *H.* refers to "*Plato* in *Plutarch*, " Tom. II. p. 36. Idem in *Phædro*, " p. 240. Conſer. Idem de Rep. Lib. II. " p. 364 and p. 378 — 381-2." But in all theſe Places, there is not one Word about *Demons* " encouraging perniciousDe- " luſions." Nay, *Plato* condemns *Homer*, and other Poets, for ſuch Figments, and adds Παίζη ἄρα ἀψευδές τὸ δαιμόνιόντε καὶ τὸ θεῖον. Mr. *H.* was ſo far conſcious of this, that he has put this Note immediately after the References before-mentioned, *viz.* " where," *i. e.* in the Places juſt now re- ferr'd to, " indeed he [*Plato*] uſeth the " Word θεοὶ; yet δαίμονες, 'tis PROBABLE, are " to be underſtood by it:" Why ſo? " FOR, thus *Proclus* ſays, that *Plato*, in " *many Places*, calls *Demons*, *Gods*:" Ergo,

in this Place. Is it not a very ſtrong Argument to prove that *Plato* thought *Demons* Encouragers of *Frauds and Deluſions*, that he expreſsly ſays, *The Nature of God and Demons is altogether free from Deluſions?*

In Truth, the Ancients at firſt, look'd upon Demons as *good* Beings: ἐσθλοὶ, ſo *Heſiod*; *Plato* calls them ἅγνοι, *pure*. *Menander*, when he had ſaid that Every Man had a Guardian Demon, Conductor of his Life, immediately adds,

Ἀγαθὸς, κακὸν γὰρ δαίμον' ὐ νομιστέον
Εἶναι, βίου βλάπτοντα χρηστόν. ——

— ἅπαντας ἀγαθὸν εἶναι τὸν θεόν.

i.e. a Good one, *for we muſt not think* any Demon *to be* Evil, *hurtful to a good Life, but every* God *to be* Good.

Clemens Alexandrinus quotes, indeed, *Phocylides* to prove that he thought ſome Demons to be *Evil*: But the Verſes which he cites, prove only, there were Good *Demons*, *which drive away Evil from every Man that enters Life*; but not a Word is there of any Evil *Demons*, promoting Wickedneſs in Man.

Αλλ' ἄρα δαίμονες εἰσιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσιν ἄλλοτε ἄλλοι
Οἱ μὲν, ὑπερχομένυ κακὸν ἀνέρος ἐκλύσασθαι.

But

But as theſe Lines are from a Poem now loſt, we can know no more than what is ſaid by *Clemens*.

Empedocles, indeed, is quoted by *Plutarch*, who thinks *his* Opinion preferable to *Menander*'s, that δύσσαι μοῖραι καὶ δαίμονες, *Two Fates and Demons* take and govern every Man that is born. But This was to explain the different Characters, and different Paſſions, which made Life unequal. How does it hence appear that Demons were conceived by *Empedocles* to be *malevolent Beings, delighting or delighted in promoting Wickedneſs*? He imagined, indeed, that if *Demons were guilty of any* Crimes, *they were* puniſhed by *ſtrange Revolutions 'till they were purified*; and *then they were reſtored to their own natural Region and Order*. *Plut.* de *Iſid. et Oſir. p.* 361. Ἐμπεδοκλῆς δικὰς φησὶ διδόναι τὰς Δαίμονας ὧν ἐξαμάρτωσι καὶ πλημμελήσωσιν --- ἄχεις οὖ κυλινδέντες οὕτω καὶ καθαρθέντες αὖθις τὴν κατὰ φύσιν χώραν καὶ τάξιν ἀπολάβωσι. But what is this to *malevolent, maleficent Beings, promoting Miſery among Men*?

One Thing I would obſerve further, that tho' ſome imagined Demons to be created Beings originally ſuperior to Man, yet others conceived no more than a Change made in Souls: And they reaſoned, that as

fromEarth, Water; from Water, Air; from Air Fire, was made, the Nature of Things changing into ſomething more noble; ſo Good Souls receiv'd a Change, from Men to Heroes, from Heroes to Demons; and ſome few being throughly purged and purified, they at length partook of Divinity. Others, indeed, that could not get the maſtery of themſelves, led an obſcure and lightleſs Life, and came into mortal Bodies again. *v. Plut. de Orac. defec.* This Hypotheſis, as well as the other which ſuppoſes Demons originally ſuperior to Man, will equally account for all Phœnomena to which Demons are applied; and yet admits no malevolent, maleficent Beings, promoting the Miſery of Man.

But were they not deem'd malevolent Beings, when they ſent Diſtempers, Plagues, *e.g.* and extraordinary Evils upon Mankind?

I answer, No: They did not conceive *Apollo* to be a "malevolent Being, de-"delighting, or ſeeming at leaſt delighted, "in the Indulgence of cruel Inclinations, "in promoting Wickedneſs, Impoſture "and Miſery amongſt Men," tho' they imagined him to ſend that violent Diſtemper to the *Grecian* Army. It is one Thing to puniſh Injuſtice; it is another to be immoral, and promote and inſpire

Fraud

Fraud and Wickedneſs. *This* was never imputed to *Demons* antiently; the *Other* was: And therefore, to underſtand a *Greek* Book, where the Word *Demon* occurs often without any Definition of it, it muſt be neceſſary to know what was the Notion of that Word in *Greek*, before, and at, the Time when ſuch Book was wrote.

Before I proceed, it is but common Juſtice to take Notice of an Error in the *Second Enquiry*, p. 19, 41. where the Author has ſuppoſed *Ocellus Lucanus* to ſpeak of *Evil Demons*. *Ocellus* had no ſuch Notions; κακοδαίμονες therefore ſhould have been tranſlated *Unhappy*, and the Paragraph be changed, ſo as to ſhew *Ocellus* to be *with* the Enquirer, and not an antient Teſtimony *againſt* him. But this by the Bye. I now return to the *Impartial Hand*.

The firſt eleven Pages of his Book are employ'd about *the Devil* (ὁ διάβολος) to which I ſhall not trouble my Reader with any Reply, ſince *the Devil's Exiſtence* is out of the Queſtion: It is the *Meaning* of the Words *Demons* (δαίμονες) and *Demoniacks* (οἱ δαιμονιζόμενοι) that is the preſent Subject of Debate; and the *Enquirer*, from "the Firſt, to the Thirty-"fifth *Page* of his *firſt Tract*," plainly ſhews

ſhews in what Senſe theſe Words were taken by the Ancients: This *Impartial Perſon* is of Opinion (*p.* 12.) that "he is "ſo far from proving what he would needs "have believed, that he thinks, his own "learned Labours make againſt him: For "he (*the Enquirer*) ſhews, and confeſſes, that the Opinion of Men's being "poſſeſs'd was univerſal; but he (*the Enquirer*) thinks the whole World was "miſtaken. Now this is highly incredible, that Men in all Ages, and of all "Perſuaſions, ſhould always be miſtaken "in a *Matter of Fact*."——The *Enquirer*'s Deſign was to ſhew that the *Antients* believed ſome Sorts of Diſtempers to be occaſioned by *Demons*; who were, nevertheleſs, never accounted by them *Devils*, or *malevolent*, *miſchievous Beings*: and This the Enquirer has fully proved. How then do "his own learned Labours make "againſt him?"—The Heathens could not *naturally* account for certain Diſorders; and therefore, they *ſuppoſed Demons* to occaſion them; and why might they not be miſtaken in a Suppoſition of a Matter, they knew nothing at all of? And why is it called a *Matter of Fact?* Such an Expreſſion imports a moſt evident or *certain* Truth; but was there any *Certainty*, for this groundleſs Suppoſition:

ſition: Or, what Evidence is there for ſuch a Fact, beſides the Uſe of a Word, which does not neceſſarily imply any ſuch Matter of Fact? Theſe Ancients had no other Proof, no other Certainty of this *Matter of Fact*, than that Men were *melancholick* or *Epileptick*; which, ſince they could not account for, they called them *Cerriti*, *Larvati*, *Lymphatici*, *Bacchantes*, &c.

BUT this *Impartial Writer* is of Opinion (*p.* 13.) that the Ancients "Nick-"named" the *Devil* and his *Imps*, calling "one *Hercules*, another *Minerva*," *&c.* not knowing (to be ſure) their real Names; and that they believed theſe *Demons* to be *Devils*, only they "miſ-"called" them. What Ancient Evidence is there for *this* pretended *Matter of Fact*?— It happens unluckily, that many of theſe *heatheniſh Demons* are known to be at firſt really *Men* (Dwellers upon Earth) and after Death to have been *canonized* and made *Demons*; notwithſtanding the Author of the REPLY ſeems to imagine, that *Jupiter*, *Mercury*, &c. *had not been Men* at all, but were *imaginary* Beings. (*p.* 7, 8.) If this be a conteſted Point by the Author of the REPLY, I only deſire him to confute the *Chriſtian* Apologiſts; and particularly,

ticularly, *Tertullian*'s Apology, *ch.* x, xi. *Arnobius*, &c.

WHAT Notions the antient *Jews* might have of *Poſſeſſion* is needleſs to enquire, ſince it is not their *Notions*, but the *Grounds* of them, we are to conſider, which can only be drawn from the Old Teſtament. Now, the *Impartial Writer* does not trouble his Reader with any Thing about them. He "frankly owns, "that we are not obliged, in the Caſe "of *Saul*, to believe any real Poſſeſſion;" but that "one Spirit cloſely attended on "*Saul* upon the Departure of another." This Interpretation he allows the Reader to reject, if he pleaſes; only he "is apt "to think that what *David* did was in-"tended to ſerve as a faint ADUMBRA-"TION of what his adorable Son would "do when he appeared in the World." (*p.* 16.) Be it ſo: I would not, upon any Account, conteſt this Matter; tho' I fear that a Notion of ſuch *typical Spirits* will have little Effect or Impreſſion on the Minds of unbelieving Men.

WE now come to the New Teſtament; and the firſt Inſtance of *Demons* (δαιμόνια) he produces from thence, is, *James* ii. 19. τὰ δαιμόνια πιςεύουσι, — *Demons believe:* Which Caſe, he ſays, "diſtreſſes "the *Enquirer* much:" (*p.* 17.) And becauſe

becauſe the *Enquirer* aſſerts that *Demons* here may not ſignify *malevolent Beings*, but ſuch Beings as the Word Δαίμονες ſignified in its original Uſe, this Writer is pleaſed to affirm, " It may be ſeen from hence " what a Man will do for the Sake of an " Hypotheſis." He goes on thus: " The " Expreſſion of St. *James*, τὰ δαιμόνια, ſeems " to be as extenſive and unlimited, as if it " had been ſaid, πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια, *All De-* " *mons.* And if St. *James* had meant *de-* " *parted Beings* only, he would have ſaid not " δαιμόνια," (which, according to the *Enquirer*, imports nothing bad) " but κακοδαί- " μονες."--- That *Demons* in this Place ſignify only *Devils*, *the very worſt of Beings*, ſhould have been *proved*, not barely *affirmed*. That the " Expreſſion τὰ δαιμόνια ſeems as " extenſive as if it had been ſaid Πάντα τὰ " δαιμόνια (*all Demons*)" is eaſy to believe; but there is no Reaſon to believe, that the Apoſtle means *Devils* only by that Word, ſince they are always diſtinguiſhed from *Demons* by another Name. The Reaſon why this Paſſage has been interpreted of the *Apoſtate Angels*, is partly founded on a miſtaken Meaning of the Word Δαιμόνια, and partly becauſe of the Word φρίσσουσι (*they fear.*) But this latter Term may as well be ſaid of *good* and *happy* Beings as of any other, to expreſs their juſt *Awe* and

religious *Fear* of God. In which Senſe the ſame Words (δαίμονες φρίσσουσι) are remarkably uſed by *Orpheus* in his *Hymns*, who joins in the ſame Line *Demons* and *Gods*, and never mentions *Demons* as *Evil Beings*, but always with the greateſt Reverence. His Words are,

Δαίμονες ὧν φρίσσουσι, θεῶν ἣ δέδοικεν ὁμιλος.

Which may very well be the proper Interpretation of St. *James*; as making very good Senſe, and agreeable to the Notions of the Antients.

But ſuppoſing that the real Senſe of St. *James* ſhould be, that *Apoſtate Spirits believe and tremble*, what will it prove? Only this, That the fallen Angels *exiſt*, not that they *have Power* to introduce *Diſorders* in the Affairs of *Providence*, cruelly to *torment* poor Men, and artfully *ſeduce* us from the Ways of Virtue and Religion; when we have Paſſions *within*, and the tempting Lures of *Power*, *Riches*, and a thouſand Evils from *without*, to ſtruggle with. We are told by ſome indeed, that we are *born* to Vice, and have a *natural Tendency* to Wickedneſs, before we can diſtinguiſh Good from Evil, or our Right Hand from the Left. Why needs there then an inviſible ſpiritual World of Evil Beings to drive us onward to Iniquity? Why muſt whole Troops of Devils,

powerful,

powerful, perſuaſive, and malevolent Devils, *delighted in promoting Wickedneſs*, march about the Earth to grapple with weak Men? *As if* it were not reaſonable to believe, that GOD has in Fact ſet them Laws and Bounds which they cannot paſs: *As if* he would not, in his good Providence, reſtrain them from *promoting Wickedneſs*: *As if* it were not enough to be ſurrounded with Temptations, and to have ſuch Appetites and Paſſions as we all have, but we muſt be attacked by *inviſible* Enemies, who can impoſe upon our *Minds*; and by this means the beſt and wiſeſt Men can have no Means to know when and how they are impoſed on, nor to avoid the Snare laid for them: Or if they can do this; is it not making their Duties more difficult and hard, than a good and kind Parent can be conceived to make them?

'TIS further aſked, *p.* 18. "Why may "not St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* x. 20. mean *Apoſtate* "*Spirits?*" I anſwer; becauſe he ſpeaks not of them, but of *Demons*, the *heathen Deities*, which in the Old Teſtament are often called *Vanities* (אלילים, * *Nihilitates*, *Nothings*) *Pſal.* xcvi. 5. *All the Gods of the Nations are* (Nothings) *Idols.* (In the LXX. it is, δαιμόνια) and *Jerem.* xviii. 15. *My Peo-*

* Vide *Leigh*'s Critica Sacra, or *Pagninus*, *Buxtorf*, or any *Hebrew* Lexicon.

ple have burnt Incenſe to Vanity. Therefore to have "a Friendſhip with thoſe imaginary Entities," to *truſt* in them, to *burn Incenſe* to them; however abſurd ſuch *Acts* are, yet the *Expreſſions* are proper, and not ſo ridiculous as this Author thinks them to be. But St. *Paul*, 'tis ſaid, "with the utmoſt Propriety and "Force, mentions the Beings on whom the "Honour ultimately devolved." *p.* 19. He mentions *Demons*, not *Devils:* But the *Impartial Hand* makes no Diſtinction between *Devil* and *Demon*, though the Scriptures conſtantly do.

I think he is as unhappy in his *Interpretation* of the Paſſage in 1 *Tim.* iv. 1. *In the latter Times ſome ſhall depart from the Faith,* (ἀποστήσονται) *giving heed to* ſeducing Spirits, (πνεύμασι πλάνοις) *and Doctrines* OF Demons, (διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων) *ſpeaking Lies in Hypocriſy, having their Conſciences ſeared with a hot Iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abſtain from Meats.* Now, he very wiſely aſks the *Enquirer*, "Do dead Men or de-"parted Souls *ſpeak Lies in Hypocriſy? p.* 20. Do they *forbid to marry*, &c." And I aſk him in return, Do you know, that the *Enquirer* refers his Reader to Mr. *Mede*'s Expoſition of this Paſſage? And was it not fit and becoming an *Impartial Hand* to have replied to what is there mentioned? But ſtill (he thinks) "it is plain from the Context, that

"the

" the Apoſtle did not mean the *Worſhip* of " *departed Souls*, but *Doctrines* that were ad- " vanced by very wicked and cunning MEN, " *Men* that had more in them of the *diabo-* " *lical* Nature and Diſpoſition than the hu- " man." *p.* 21. Thus then it appears, that the Word *Demons* does not only import *Devils*, but ſometimes " *cunning* MEN of " *wicked Diſpoſitions.*"

ST. *Paul* is ſpeaking of the Doctrines which wicked Men would follow in the *latter Times*, Times ſucceeding the infant State of the Goſpel; and he begins this *Prophecy* with Ἀποστήσονται, they (Men) ſhall *revolt* from God: For Ἀποστασία, and סָרָה, the Word that anſwers to it in *Hebrew*, ſignify a *Revolt* from God, i. e. *Idolatry:* Προσέχοντες πνεύμασι πλάνοις, *giving heed to deceitful falſe* Doctrines, ---- for ſo πνεύματα often implies; thus πνεῦμα Ἀντιχρίστου, the *Doctrine of Antichriſt*; and 1 *John* iv. 1. *believe not every* Doctrine (πνεύματι) *but try the* Doctrines (τὰ πνεύματα) *whether they be of God: Becauſe many falſe Prophets are gone out into the World*; i. e. many Men that teach *falſe Doctrines:* --- *giving heed to Doctrines* OF or CONCERNING Demons, διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων; thus *Jer.* x. 18. διδασκαλία ματαίων, *Doctrines* CONCERNING *Vanities*, or Idols; not *Doctrines taught by Vanities*, or " imaginary En- " tities:" And *Heb.* vi. 2. διδαχὴ βαπτισμῶν,

μῶν, *Doctrines* CONCERNING *Baptiſms*, not, *Baptiſms teach Doctrines*, which would be ridiculous.

HE goes on---- *Revel.* xviii. 2. *An Angel cried mightily with a loud Voice, ſaying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, and become the Habitation of Demons* (δαιμόνων.) --- " This (*he thinks*, p. 21.) " was to paint, in livelieſt " Colours, the HORRIBLE Deſolation of the " Place. Ancient *Babylon*, we all know, " has been long ago fallen, and when mo- " dern *Babylon* ſhall be in the ſame Condi- " tion, of *which* this *perhaps* is a Prophecy." Now the Condition of old fallen *Babylon* is deſcribed *Iſa.* xiii. 21. *Wild Beaſts of the Deſart ſhall lie there, and their Houſes ſhall be full of doleful Creatures, and Owls ſhall dwell there, and Satyrs* (שעיר) *ſhall* dance *there.* " By this (ſays the *Enquirer*, p. 34. of 2d *Enquiry*) " no more is intended, than " that *Babylon* ſhall be ſo totally deſtroyed, " that *Goats*, and all ſorts of Birds and Beaſts, " ſhall live in her deſolate Houſes." But this does not ſatisfy the *Impartial Hand*; it is not HORRIBLE enough for him. It is certainly a Prophecy of modern *Babylon*'s being in the ſame Condition with ancient *Babylon*. And it is not, it ſeems, HORRIBLE enough to ſay that it ſhall totally be deſtroyed; but the Meaning is, " It ſhall be the Habitation of " *Fiends* or *Devils*, that promoted the idola-

" trous

" trous Worſhip; this Repreſentation directly " makes us to deteſt and to loath the Place." Did the Prophet deſign then to give us Words, or really to declare the Truth of Facts? Or does this Author think the Place where ancient *Babylon* ſtood, to be literally the *Habitation of Devils?* Do they *dance* there? Do they continue ſtill to *dance* there? Or did they do it only when *Babylon* was deſtroyed?

WHILST I am treating on the Meaning of the Word *Demons*, in the *Revelations*, I can't but take notice of the Author of the *Reply*, who being to refute the *Enquirer's* Interpretation of *Rev.* ix. 20. he tells us, " That " having no Skill in expounding theſe Parts " of the *Revelations*, he had nothing to do " but to look into ſome of the moſt learned " Commentators." What was the Reſult of this? Why, truly, in order to know the meaning of the Word δαιμόνια, he finds " that *Grotius* underſtands it of Money, *&c.* " which the Men of *Jeruſalem* were de- " voted to then, and made their Idols." An excellent Method of finding out the meaning of a Word! But did *Grotius* really underſtand, Demons, of Money? Does *Grotius* ſay ſo? He was too able and judicious a Critick to ſay ſo. He ſays indeed, " that " the *People of* Jeruſalem *were all in a* my- " ſtical Senſe Idolaters; they ſerv'd Money, " Jewels, and ſuch inanimate Things, by " which

" which they could not be ſaved in Times " of Danger." Now allowing all this, does Δαιμόνιον ſignify *Money?* Or how does it appear that *Grotius* did not mean his Words as the Interpretation of *Idols of Gold and Silver?*

JUST ſuch another Reply is given by this Author to what was ſaid to be the meaning of 1 *Tim.* iv. 1. *Reply*, p. 53. Dr. *Hammond*, *Eraſmus*, and *Jerom* are particularly mentioned, differing from each other, and all from the *Enquirer*. Dr. *Hammond* interprets *Doctrines* of Devils, *unclean, polluted, deviliſh Doctrines*. *Eraſmus* ſays, it is, " falſe Do- " ctrines which deceitful Demons ſhall bring " in by the means of Men, who inſinuate " their Lies under the Form of Godlineſs." St. *Jerom* obſerves, that " all *Hereſy* is " framed by the Art of Demons."

SEE here the true Art of confounding all Things! As if the oppoſing a Name were a Confutation of an Opinion! But how did *Jerom* know that all *Hereſy* was framed by the Art of *Demons?* Or how did *Eraſmus* know, that *Devils* brought in their falſe Doctrines in the Manner he ſays? Could not *Men* frame Hereſies by their own natural Powers? Might they not do it by Miſtakes? What Evidence is there that *Hereſies* were owing to *Devils?* May not the Wickedneſs, the Pride, the Errors of Men be the Sources

of

of falſe Doctrines? Yes, but the Apoſtle ſays, *ſeducing Spirits*, as if *evil Spirits* were the great Seducers of Men. But what if *Spirits* be here taken for Doctrines themſelves, as I before obſerved from Mr. *Mede*? Or ſuppoſe that *ſeducing Spirits*, are ſuch Men who pretended to the Inſpiration of the Spirit, but who had it not? Then ſeducing Spirits will be no more than Seducers. But I but touch on theſe Points, that the Reader may ſee the Arts made uſe of to refute the *Enquiry*, without *Reaſon*, or Pretence of it.

THE next Place to be conſidered is, *Acts* xvii. 18. where the Words Ξένων Δαιμονίων occur. The *Epicureans* and *Stoics* accuſed St. *Paul* when at *Athens*, of *being* (καταγγελεὺς) *a Setter-forth of ſtrange* Demons or *Gods*; becauſe he preached *Chriſt riſen from the dead*: What theſe Philoſophers meant by *Demons* is from hence very plain; if not, the *Enquirer* has ſufficiently ſhewn their Senſe of the Word in his Eſſays. But the *Impartial Writer* "does not think it material (*p.* 23.) to en-
"quire, what the *Epicureans* and *Stoics* at
"*Athens* meant by thus charging St. *Paul*:
"They ſaid any thing, without having *per-*
"*haps* any determinate Ideas, or hardly
"knowing what they meant themſelves.
"'Tis much more to our Purpoſe, to ſee
"what the *Jews* meant by δαίμονες or
"δαιμόνια."

I would obſerve, that theſe Philoſophers uſe a Word in their *own* Language, in its natural, original Senſe; and if we know what They meant by that Word, that ought to be deemed its meaning in their Mouths. St. *Paul* is charged with being a Setter-forth of *ſtrange Demons* by the *Epicureans* and *Stoics*. Now what was the Occaſion of this Charge? Why, he preached *Jeſus* and the Reſurrection; *i. e. Jeſus* who was dead, to be riſen again, and to be appointed Judge of the World. *ver.* 31.

THE Author of the *Reply* ſays, "the Word "*Demons* is not uſed for Devils, nor for "*Souls departed*, but for Gods or Deities in "general." And, in the preſent Caſe, it is an "Inſtance which relates to a *living Man*, "*both Soul and Body.*" p. 56. *En Acumen!* When the firſt Chriſtians aſſerted *Jupiter* and *Saturn*, &c. to have been Men, and after Death to have been made Gods; was the Point about their being alive, *both Soul and Body?* When *Heſiod* ſays, that when a certain Generation of Men died, they became Demons --- Did it make a Queſtion, whether they had *Bodies* or not? *Illos homines fuiſſe non audetis negare, ita poſt Deos factos inſtituiſtis aſſeverare.* Tertull. *Apol.*

"BUT it it more to our Purpoſe, to ſee "what the *Jews* meant by Δαίμονες." But what is it to the preſent Purpoſe, to enquire

quire what *Jews* meant by a Word which *Heathens*, not *Jews*, ſpoke? However, let us attend the *Impartial Hand* in his own Way.

" By *Beelzebub* (ſays he, *p.* 23.) the *Jews* " meant the *Old Serpent*, and *affirms* that " *Beelzebub*, *Satan*, and the *Devil* (ὁ Διά-" βολος) are equivalent Terms; and, there-" fore, becauſe our Saviour ſays, *If Satan* " *caſt out Satan, how can his Kingdom ſtand?* " *&c.* it evidently appears that our Saviour " and the *Phariſees* meant by *Demons*, *Apo-" ſtate Spirits.*" This he calls *Demonſtration.* Now ſuppoſe that the *Jews* believed that *Satan* cauſed the Diſtempers of *Demoniacks*, I aſk firſt, What Ground they had for this? Or does our Saviour himſelf aſſert any ſuch thing? No. If then he argues *hypothetically*, or uſes the common Language in every one's Mouth, he would no more *affirm Satan* to poſſeſs ſuch Men, than if he had uſed the Name of *Venereal*, he would have affirmed *Venus* to be the Cauſe of ſuch a particular Diſorder. What then becomes of this " De-" monſtration, whoſe Force is not to be " evaded, unleſs you make departed Souls " *little Satans* or *Beelzebubs*, and *Beelzebub* " himſelf a *departed Soul?*"

One Thing I think it requiſite here to take Notice of, in order to remove or to prevent Miſtakes. The *Enquirer* had ſhewn that *Originally* Demons were thought to be

departed Souls; and that certain Diſorders were imputed to *Demons*, and that hence Perſons affected in a certain manner were called *Demoniacks*; and he has ſhewn what thoſe particular Diſorders were. But I do not apprehend that he is obliged to put, as his Adverſaries do for him, *Demons* and *departed Souls* every where as ſynonymous or reciprocal Terms.

THE Origin of *Demons* was (if *Homer*, *Heſiod*, *Plato*, be of any Weight) nothing but *departed Souls*: A *later* Scheme was maintained by *Xenocrates* and *Empedocles* *, of Beings " that exceeded our Nature much " in Power, but had not the Divine Nature " pure and unmixed, in which there were " diverſe Degrees of Virtue and Vice as there " is in Men." But ſtill I do not find any mention of *morally malignant* Beings, ſuch as we term Devils, *i. e.* malevolent Beings, delighting and delighted with Wickedneſs, and promoting Impoſture and Wickedneſs among Men. *Xenocrates* indeed talked of † " *gloomy*, " *moroſe* Demons that rejoice in ſuch Days in

* Πολλῇ τῇ δυνάμει τὴν φύσιν ὑπερφέροντας ἡμῶν, τὸ δὲ θεῖον οὐκ ἀμιγὲς οὐδὲ ἄκρατον ἔχοντας — γίνονται γὰρ ὡς ἐν ἀνθρώποις καὶ δαίμοσιν, ἀρετῆς διαφοραὶ καὶ κακίας. Plut. de Iſid. & Oſir. p. 360.

† Δυςρόπους καὶ σκυθρωπὰς. αἳ χαίρουσι τοιούτοις, (viz. ἡμερῶν ἀποφράδας καὶ τῶν ἑορτῶν ὅσαι πληγάς τινας, ἢ κοπετοὺς, ἢ νηςείας, ἢ δυσφημίας, ἢ αἰσχρολογίαν ἔχουσιν) καὶ τυγχάνουσαι πρὸς οὐθὲν ἄλλο χεῖρον τρέπονται. ibid. p. 361.

" which

" which Men ſmote their Breaſts, mourned, " and faſted; and if they *have but theſe*, they " turn to *nothing worſe*." And ‡ *Empedocles* imagined that when " Demons *ſinn'd*, they " underwent ſevere Puniſhments, toſs'd from " the Air to the Sea, from Sea to Earth, " from Earth to the Sun, from Sun to the " Air, till being thus puniſhed and purified, " they again obtain their natural Region " and Order." But what is all this to evil Demons or Devils " wandring, as Mr. *Hut-* " *chinſon* ſays, through the Air, about Sea " and Land, and ſtriving with Aſſiduity and " Fierceneſs to *delude Men into Ruin*, and " *actually making ſome of the Species their* " *Prey?*" Take this Hypotheſis, and make the moſt of it (though the other is the oldeſt, and natural, and perfectly agreeable to the Origin of Idolatry in worſhipping *Ghoſts*.) Take this, I ſay, and ſtill I aſk, What Evidence have you for *morally malignant* Beings among the Antients? *Xenocrates*, who was himſelf a dark, gloomy Fellow, σκυθρὸπως.

‡ Εμπεδοκλῆς καὶ δίκας φησὶ διδόναι τοὺς δαίμονας ὧν ἐξαμάρτωσι καὶ πλημμελήσωσιν.

Αἰθέριον μὲν γὰρ σφε μένος πόντόνδε διώκει·
Πόντος δ' ἐσχθονὸς οὖδας ἀπέπτυσε· γαῖα δ' ἐς αὔγας
Ἡελίου ἀκάμαντος· ὁ δ' αἰθέρος ἔμβαλε δίναις·
Ἄλλος δ' ἐξ ἄλλου δέχεται, στυγέουσι δὲ πάντες.

(Thus *Plutarch* gives us theſe Lines in his Treatiſe *De vitando ære alieno*, p, 830.) ἄχρις οὗ κολασθέντες οὕτω καὶ καθαρθέντες, αὖθις τὴν κατὰ φύσιν χώραν καὶ τάξιν ἀπολάβωσι. Plut. de Iſid. p. 361.

Laertius

Laertius imagined *gloomy* Demons, to account for ſeveral Things in the natural and moral World: But what *Evidence* is there for even ſuch a Notion? In the firſt Place, the whole Hypotheſis is mere Fiction. In the ſecond Place, there was no Notion of ſuch *malevolent* Beings as delighted in *promoting Wickedneſs*. And thirdly, Not a Word of their poſſeſſing Men, and inflicting Miſery upon them, or wandring thro' the Air, and Earth, and Sea, for any ſuch Purpoſe. Suppoſe now that the *Enquirer* had admitted or maintained this Hypotheſis, *modern* and *groundleſs* as it is, this would not have led him to alter the Interpretation of any one Text in the New Teſtament. For here is no Evidence to prove *Poſſeſſion* from this Scheme: The Authors of it did not imagine any Thing of *malevolent* Beings, when they framed this Hypotheſis; and conſequently, this Hypotheſis does not furniſh us with *Devils* to promote Wickedneſs or Miſery amongſt Men, better than the other does. But then there is this Difference in the Caſes, that we know the *very Names* of the *Demons* who were ſuppoſed, in the other Hypotheſis, to take Poſſeſſion, and cauſe Diſtempers to Mankind: And we know that they had been once Men and Women; and conſequently, from *that* we can account for the Origin of the Language, and the whole of what was imputed

to

to Demons very conſiſtently, and better than we can from the later Notions of *Xenocrates* or *Empedocles*. But I return from this Digreſſion.

THE *Impartial Hand* leads us to an Examination of ſome *Miracles* relating to *Demoniacks*. The firſt is mentioned, *Matth.* xvii. *Luke* ix. *Mark* ix. St. *Matthew* deſcribes the *Diſorder* of this *Demoniack* in the following Manner: *He is Lunatick, and ſore vexed; for oftimes he* falleth *into the Fire, and oft into the Water.* St. *Mark* obſerves, that *he had a* dumb *Spirit: Maſter, my Son hath a* dumb *Spirit,* (St. *Luke* calls it a *Demon* and *unclean Spirit*) *and whereſoever he taketh him, he teareth him; and he* foameth, *and* gnaſheth *with his* Teeth, *and* pineth away. *The Spirit tare him, and he* fell *on the Ground, and wallowed* foaming.---- This was evidently an *epileptic* Diſorder; for " *Celſus* (*p.* 41. of " 1ſt *Enquiry)* obſerves of ſuch Perſons, the " Man all of a ſudden *falls down, foams* at " the Mouth, and when the Diſtemper is " new upon him *pineth away. Hippocrates* " has given us the Symptoms of the Epilepſy more accurately. He becomes *incapable of ſpeaking* (dumb) and is *ſuffocated,* " and *Foam* runs out of the Mouth, his " *Teeth gnaſh,* the Hands are clinch'd, or " cloſe ſhut, the Eyes are diſtorted, they " underſtand nothing: He *falls down,* he

" *kicks*

" *kicks* with his Feet. Thus is the Diſtem-
" per to *young* People, and when the Diſor-
" der is of long ſtanding, it is *not curable.*"
Does not this *exactly* anſwer to the Caſe of the *young* Perſon mentioned in the Goſpel? And was his *Lunacy* the Effect of an *epileptic Fit*, juſt as *Hippocrates* has deſcribed it? Or ſhould not an *Impartial Perſon* have conſidered what the *Enquirer* has produced from *Celſus* and *Hippocrates*, and all the Old Phyſicians? He may, if he pleaſes, ſtill *affirm*, that " what
" he can collect from hence is This, and
" only This, that the Man thought his Son
" was poſſeſſed by a *Devil.* For is it pro-
" bable *(he aſks)* that one of the *Evange-*
" *liſts* ſhould ſay, that *a Spirit tare him*;
" and another, that the *Devil* (he ſhould
" have ſaid *Demon*) *threw him down, and*
" *tare him*, in Writings deſigned for *the*
" *Uſe* of the World, if no more was in it
" than the Effects of a natural Diſorder? Is
" it probable that all the three Evangeliſts
" ſhould tell us, that *Jeſus rebuked the De-*
" *vil*, or *the unclean* Spirit? And is it *poſſible*
" (for I really won't aſk whether it be pro-
" bable) that our Saviour ſhould ſpeak to
" one labouring under a mere Diſorder only,
" theſe Words, *Thou deaf and* dumb *Spirit,*
" *I charge thee*, &c. *p.* 25." All which Queſtions, and many more, amount to this one, Is it *poſſible* or *probable*, that the *Evan-*

geliſts,

geliſts, or our *Saviour*, ſhould uſe the *Language* or Manner of expreſſing Things cuſtomary in their own Times? To which I anſwer, It is not only *poſſible* and *probable*, but highly *reaſonable*: Our *Saviour* came not to correct *Errors* in *Phyſick*, or the *Miſtakes* of *Language*; and the Writings of his Apoſtles, though "deſigned for the Uſe of the "World," were not *deſigned for the Uſe of Phyſick*, or the *Reformation* of *Philoſophy*, but of *Mens Manners*; and the "Compliance" of our Lord to the *Language of the Times*, can no more be called a "Confirmation" of *Jewiſh* Errors in the *Phyſical* Science, than that of the Prophets, in the Old Teſtament, can be called a "Confirmation" of *Aſtronomical* Errors. But there is more in this "Compliance," than perhaps this *Writer* is aware of. The *Sadducees* denied the Exiſtence of Spirits, or departed Souls in a future State, and "affirmed (as St. *Luke* tells us) "that there was *no Reſurrection, neither Angel nor Spirit*. To affront and cry down "whoſe Error, it is like enough, the *Phariſees*, and the reſt of the right-believing "*Jews*, who followed them, affected to "draw their Expreſſions (whereſoever they "could) from Angels and Spirits." *Mede's Diſcourſes*, p. 29. If this Obſervation of this Great Man be juſt, then had our Saviour reproved the *Jews* for an Error of this kind,

it is more than *probable*, that many of the *Jews* would have entertained greater Prejudices againſt him, and the Goſpel might have met with ſtronger Oppoſition than it really did. Thus too, in the Old Teſtament, the *Sun*, and not the *Earth*, is often ſaid to move, though it be falſe in Fact. 'Tis poſſible that had the inſpired Writers declared the *Aſtronomical* Truth to the *Jews*, it would have ſeem'd ſo abſurd and contradictory to the ſeeming Experience of their Senſes, that they would not at that Time have believed them. So, when *Jeſus* was aſked by his *Diſciples*, John ix. 1. concerning the blind Man, *Who did ſin, this Man or his Parents, that he was born blind?* Tho' they believed, as many *Jews* then did, the *Præ-exiſtence* of human Souls, ſent on Earth to be puniſhed for Sins committed in their former *præ-exiſting* State; our Lord does not rectify their Miſtake: And from hence our Author may, if he pleaſe, conclude that human Souls præ-exiſted in a former State, and that our preſent State is a State of Puniſhment; but if he does not think this alſo a "PEG" of the Chriſtian Edifice, ſo neither ſhould he blame the *Enquirer* for ſuppoſing *Jeſus* to uſe Expreſſions ſuitable to the Times, whoſe Buſineſs it was neither to correct ſuch Errors, nor to ſatisfy Men's idle Curioſities.

BUT this Writer imagines, that our Saviour, upon the *Enquirer*'s Notions, was not contented with not correcting, but he *confirmed* the Miſtakes of Men, *p.* 26.

I anſwer, Juſt ſo much as when a Phyſician uſes the Terms of Art in his Profeſſion, or does not confute a received Notion, can be ſaid to *confirm* the Miſtakes of Men. When he ſpeaks of *Lunacy*, or uſes the Word, he does not *confirm* the Miſtakes of ſuch as imagine the *Moon* to be the Cauſe of *Lunacy*, or that that Planet influences ſuch as labour under that Diſorder. He *muſt* uſe the Terms which Cuſtom has eſtabliſhed; and he that is ignorant, muſt e'en continue ignorant ſtill.

THE *Impartial Hand* proceeds, "When "*Jeſus* had ſpoke the forementioned Words, "viz. *Thou deaf and dumb Spirit*, &c. the "Amount of which is, *Be thou cured*; the "Man was not cured, but worſe a great "deal than he was before; for he was vio-"lently rent, and at laſt thought to be dead. "Is it now imaginable, that after *Jeſus* had "bid the Patient be well, he ſhould notwith-"ſtanding remain afflicted? But ſuppoſing "a *Demon* in the Caſe, then all is to be ac-"counted for with the *greateſt Eaſe* in the "World." *p.* 27. How! Is not the ſame Queſtion to be anſwered in either Caſe? Whether the *Devil* or a *Diſeaſe* afflicted him,

may it not ſtill be aſked,--- " Is it imagina-
" ble, that after *Jeſus* had bid the Patient
" be well, *or the Devil be gone*, the Diſeaſe,
" *or the Devil*, ſhould dare to remain?"
But to this I ſhall ſpeak particularly by and by.

He proceeds, *p.* 28. to conſider what follows. The *Diſciples* aſk *Jeſus*, *Why could not we caſt him out? And he ſaid unto them, Becauſe of your Unbelief: Howbeit, this Kind goeth not out but by* Prayer *and* Faſting. Which laſt Words, the *Enquirer* obſerves, " may not relate to the Difficulty propoſed;" for *Prayer* and *Faſting* were not uſed upon theſe Occaſions neither by *Chriſt* nor his *Apoſtles* (that we read of;) and the Anſwer to their Difficulty is plainly diſtinguiſhed from what follows, by the Word HOWBEIT. In anſwer to this, it is aſked, " Who can " imagine that St. *Mark* would record the " Queſtion, and no Part of the Anſwer?" For St. *Mark* only recites theſe latter Words of *Prayer* and *Faſting*, and takes no Notice of their *Unbelief*. But are not many Things omitted by one Evangeliſt, which are mentioned by another? And be it never ſo hard to " imagine," is it not true in Fact that St. *Mark* mentions not *Unbelief* as a Reaſon of their Inability to cure the Man? Yet he recites part of what our Saviour then ſaid, --- *This Kind can come forth by nothing*, (or *cometh*

cometh not forth) *but by* Prayer *and* Faſting, προσευχῇ καὶ νηστείᾳ, which Words may proverbially imply no more than the *Difficulty* of curing ſuch Diſorders, as the *Latin* Proverb, *Nec* PRECE *nec* PRETIO, ſignifies. Or grant this to be part of the Anſwer, and that *Prayer* and *Faſting*, in a LITERAL *Senſe*, were neceſſary Means to the Cure; yet how is the *Devil* neceſſarily concerned in the Caſe? May not theſe Means be expedient to expel *Diſtempers*, as well as to drive away the *Devil*? As to the Criticiſm προσεχεῖ προσεχει, for προσευχῇ, which is a natural and eaſy Emendation, all that is ſaid is, That " by taking ſuch Liberties, a Man even " of ordinary Abilities may do ſurprizing " Things:" And does not the *Enquirer* acknowledge, that " it may be thought to be " cutting the Knot?" *p.* 31. Yes; " but " it is not only cutting the *Knot*, but cut- " ting the *Thread*, cutting what is *cloſely* " connected and *joined*." Now, what Art has this *Impartial*, this *ſteady Hand* found out, whereby to cut a *Knot*, without cutting the *Thread*, or without " dividing what is " cloſely connected and joined?" I proceed to conſider the next Inſtance of *Poſſeſſion* recorded by the three Evangeliſts, *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke*.

Matth. viii. 28. When *Jeſus* came into the Country of the *Gergaſens*, *there met him two*

two Demoniacks (δαιμονιζόμενοι) exceeding fierce, *ſo that no Man might paſs that Way. Mark* v. 2, 3, 4, 5. *When Jeſus came, there met him a Man with an unclean Spirit; no Man could bind him, no not with Chains; becauſe he had been often bound with Fetters and* Chains, *and the* Chains had been plucked aſunder by him, *and the* Fetters broken in Pieces; *neither could any Man* tame him: *And always Night and Day he was in the Mountains, and in the Tombs,* crying, *and* cutting *himſelf with Stones. Luke* viii. 27, 29. *There met* Jeſus *a certain Man who had* Demons *long Time, and* wear no Cloaths, *neither abode in any Houſe, but in the Tombs: And* he *was* kept bound *with* Chains, *and in* Fetters; *and he* brake the Bands, *and was driven of the* Demon (ὑπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος) *into the Wilderneſs.*

THIS is the Account which the *Evangeliſts* have given of the *Demoniack*'s Caſe; and every Symptom mentioned plainly ſhews that the Diſorder was direct *Madneſs*. And though it be true, that now no Man would aſcribe Madneſs to a Demon as its Cauſe, yet in thoſe Days it was common, both with *Jews* and *Gentiles*, to call *Mad-men*, eſpecially ſome Sorts of them, *Demoniacks*. The Reaſons for our Lord's Compliance with their Manner of expreſſing Things, I have before fully conſidered; However, I will take the

the Liberty to ſay ſomething more on this Point.

THE *Enquirer* had ſaid; "Were a Pro-"phet from Heaven to cure *St. Anthony's* "*Fire*, he does not ſuppoſe that he would "take Care to guard People againſt St. *An-*"*thony*, or think, that he encouraged *Ido-*"*latry* by the Uſe of thoſe Words." Upon which the Author before me "prays, *(p.* 60.) "to aſk him *(this)* only one Queſtion; "would a Prophet from Heaven ſay to ſuch "an afflicted Perſon, St. *Anthony*, thou fiery "Spirit, *I charge thee come out of him, and* "*enter no more into him?*"

I anſwer; If St. *Anthony* were ſuppoſed the immediate *Cauſe* of the Diſorder, he might ſay ſo, without Abſurdity: And if Men now aſcribed, as formerly they did, Diſeaſes to *Demons*, I believe ſome ſuch Expreſſion would be uſed by ſuch a Prophet; who might as well *rebuke* this Diſorder in that Language, as our Saviour himſelf did a *Fever*, Luke iv. 28, 29. *Simon's Wife's Mother was taken with a great Fever, and they beſought* Jeſus *for her; and he ſtood over her and* rebuked the Fever, *and it left her.* 'Tis further urged, that, *Luke* xiii. 32. our Saviour diſtinguiſhes between *Cures* and *Ejection* of *Demons*; *Behold I caſt out* Demons, *and I do* Cures. But what was the *Ground* or *Reaſon* for this *Diſtinction?* Only the different Cauſes attri-

attributed to different Diſorders by both *Jews* and *Gentiles*; who looked on ſome as *natural*, and believed others to ariſe from extraordinary Cauſes.

But let us ſuppoſe *Devils* "the very "worſt of Beings," to have been the Cauſes of the Diſtempers imputed to them. It appears then (upon this Hypotheſis) that God muſt give *Beelzebub*, and his Hoſt of "little "Satans," a Licence to *torment* Men, and *deprive* them of Judgment, to *ſeduce* them from God's Service, and to be the Means of their preſent and future Miſery. Are there not any Difficulties in this Suppoſition, which may have "Weight with thinking Men?" And what is the Anſwer given to them? He ſays (*p.* 61.) that *Demoniacks* "were "Men loſt to all Senſe of Goodneſs and "Virtue; living and even delighting in a "profligate Life; no common Calamity is "capable of *reclaiming* them, or giving the "Mind a new Turn: In this State we "may ſuppoſe the *apoſtate Spirits* to aſſault "them."

But why may we *ſuppoſe* all this? What Ground is there for the Suppoſition? What Evidence has he for ſuch a Matter of Fact? He ſuppoſes indeed theſe poſſeſs'd Perſons to have been loſt to all Senſe of Virtue and Goodneſs: *p.* 61. but he concludes, *p.* 62. "Far be it from me to *affirm* that this has

"happened

" happened in the Manner, or for the Rea-
" ſons I have mentioned; GOD forbid I
" ſhould be guilty of *ſuch Preſumption.*"
A plain Confeſſion that he has no *Evidence* for his Suppoſition, but only the mere Sound of a Word! But to return to the *Gaderene Demoniacks.*

They cried out, ſaying, what have we to do with thee, Jeſus thou Son of God? Art thou come hither to torment us (πρὸ καιροῦ) before the Time? Matt. viii. 29. Where the Words πρὸ καιροῦ may ſignify no more than Πρόωρον *or* ἀκαίρως *(untimely, unſeaſonably)* as the *Enquirer* has obſerved. This ſtands *(p.*35.) condemned without any Reaſon, unleſs this be one, " That it would be natural and al-
" moſt neceſſary (according to the *Enquirer*'s
" Account) from the Mouths of Mad-men
" to ſay, not, art thou come hither *unſea-*
" *ſonably* or *untimely* to vex us; but rather,
" art thou come hither *opportunely* or ſeaſon-
" ably, to ſhew thy Goodneſs, *&c.*" What would be *natural* or *neceſſary* for theſe Mad-men to ſay, is not eaſy to determine: But certain I am, that πρὸ καιροῦ neither can, nor ever did ſignify *opportunely*; nor does the *Enquirer*'s Hypotheſis *neceſſarily* require thoſe Words to ſignify the contrary of what they do ſignify. Now according to the *Enquirer* the Meaning of the whole Verſe is ---- The *Fame* of *Jeſus* had been *ſpread abroad*, and

reach'd to *Gadarene*; and when *Jeſus* came to the Place where theſe Lunaticks were, they, perhaps hearing his Diſciples (at a Diſtance) call him *Jeſus*, or having heard of him; or having heard a *Deſcription* of him; *ran and worſhipped him*, Mark v. 6. This too may poſſibly have been the Effect of ſuch a *lucid Interval*, as *Mad-men* ſometimes have: Then *they cried out to* Jeſus, *what have we to do with thee*, who cureſt *Demoniacks*; have not we been *fettered* and *beaten*, and art thou come in an *ill Hour* to *vex* us, as others have done before, in order to cure us? ---- This I take to be the Senſe which the *Enquirer* may give to this Paſſage: I ſhall, at preſent, only defend the *Enquirer's Hypotheſis* againſt the Objections of our *Impartial Hand*. He ſays, the Diſciples themſelves knew not that *Jeſus* was any more than an "extra-"ordinary Man;" becauſe in their Paſſage to *Gergaſene* they ſaid, *What manner of Man is this, that even the Winds and the Sea obey him?* And none of the *Gergaſens* could inform the *Demoniacks* of *Jeſus*; "becauſe, "if they knew themſelves, they all flyed "theſe two raving Men." How then could the *Demoniacks* know *Jeſus?* I anſwer, with the *Enquirer*, in the Words of the Evangeliſt, "that *Jeſus* went about all *Galilee*, "preaching the Goſpel of the *Kingdom*, and "healing all manner of Sickneſs, and all

"manner

" manner of Diſeaſe among the People, and " his *Fame* went throughout *Syria*; and " there followed him *great Multitudes* of " People from *Galilee*, *Decapolis*, *Jeruſa-* " *lem*, *Judæa*, and from beyond *Jordan*." Therefore ſome of the *Gergaſens* might eaſily *know* Jeſus, and *deſcribe* him to theſe *Lunaticks*, or tell them of him, or they might know him by any of the Ways before mentioned. As to the *Diſciples* ſaying, *what manner of Man is this?* It does not with Certainty appear, that the *Diſciples* ſaid any ſuch Thing: For *Matt.* viii. 25. the Diſciples were *perſuaded* that CHRIST had *Power over the Winds and the Sea*, and therefore, *when the Ship was covered with the Waves*, they *came to him*, *ſaying*, *Lord* ſave *us*: But, *ver.* 27. *The* MEN *marvelled and ſaid*, *what Manner of Man is this?* Now, how does it appear that the MEN were the Diſciples of *Jeſus*, and not the *Sailers* of the Ship? But if the Diſciples and great Multitudes of People in many Places, even in *Gergaſene*, ſhould know *Jeſus*, yet " none could " *inform* the *Mad-men* of *Jeſus*," none could *deſcribe* him unto them, for " they all flyed." I aſk, When did they *all fly?* And did they *always* " *fly*" theſe Mad-men? No; for they *bound them with Fetters and Chains*, tho' *unable* to *tame* them: Since then *all Men* were not *always* at a Diſtance from theſe

raving *Gergaſens*, why might they not *ſometime or other* have been informed of *Jeſus*? Not to inſiſt any longer on ſo plain a Circumſtance, I proceed to conſider the *Name* of this *Demoniack (Legion.)*

Mark v. 9. *Jeſus aſked him his Name; and he anſwered, my Name is* Legion, *for we are many.* The Senſe of this Verſe, according to the *Enquirer*, is ---- Our Lord aſked the *Mad-man* (not an "indefinite" Number of Devils) *what was* His *Name*; and He *anſwered* Legion; for I have "about ſix "thouſand ſix hundred Devils in me." This was indeed a mad Reply; though not unlike what a mad Perſon told the *Enquirer* himſelf (p. 52. of 1ſt *Enquiry.)* In his Adverſary's Opinion, the Senſe of this Verſe is as follows: --- *Jeſus* aſked a *Legion* of *Devils* (i. e. an "indefinite" Number of *Devils) what was* His *Name*, and He, the *Devils*, anſwer'd, His Name is Legion, or an "indefinite" Number of *Devils.* ---- The *Impartial Writer* objects, "that it "would be of no Service to know the poor "Lunatick's Name." *p.* 36. And, I aſk, of *what Service could it be to know* the poor Devil's Name; (ſuppoſing them to have *Names* as well as different Degrees of *Order.)* If it be reply'd, that it was to be ſatisfy'd of the *Number* of Devils, --- the Queſtion would not ſurely then have been, *what is thy Name?*

But,

But, *what is your Number?* And it ſeems remarkably odd, that after this Information from the *Devils*, that they were in Number a *Legion*, our Saviour ſhould yet *ſay unto* HIM, *Come out* THOU *unclean Spirit*; as if *One only Devil* poſſeſſed the Man: And how came it about that *One only Devil* drove the *Demoniack* into the Wilderneſs, when he had within him a *Legion of Devils?* 'Tis anſwered (*p.* 55.) that our Lord ſpoke only to the *Chief*, or *Leader*, of the reſt; or as Mr. *Twells* ſays, *That one Devil whom our Lord called out, was the* Commander *of the* Legion, *whom every* Demon *that* ſerved *him was obliged to* follow. *Anſwer to the Enquiry, p.* 43. This puts me in mind of Dr. *Henry More*'s Solution of this Caſe, " Nor need it " ſeem ſo harſh, that ſo great a Number " be buſied about *one ſorry Wight*. For " that military Word, *Legion*, ſuggeſts un- " to us a very fit and eaſy Solution of this " Difficulty, *viz.* That this did not hap- " pen *primarily*, but by Conſequence: The " *chief Commander* of this *dark Regiment* " having his uſual Haunt and Recourſe to " him, and therefore the *Obſeſſion* of this " *numerous Rabble* is only by Sequel; as if " ſome *Captain* ſhould make his Stay for his " own Pleaſure in ſome blind ſolitary Cot- " tage in the Field, it would be no wonder " to ſee the Houſe beſet with the Multi-

" tude

" tude of his Soldiers, they being there in " Attendance on *him*, rather than in any " Satisfaction or Advantage to themſelves, " there not being a proportionable Booty " for ſo great a Company; but the *Place* " notwithſtanding would not fail to be *foully* " peſter'd by them. After this Sort it fared " with this miſerable Demoniack, who could " not but be even *ſtifled* with the Throng " of this *helliſh Legion*." *More's Myſtery of Godlineſs*, *p.* 80.

Now, firſt, This *Chief*, or *Commander*, is a mere Invention, founded, as Dr. *More* owns, upon the military Word, *Legion*. 2. The Name *Legion* was not given to this *dark Regiment*, becauſe it had ONE Chief and Subalterns and common Soldiers; but was uſed only to expreſs that the Man had many Devils in him. *He ſaid*, Legion; BECAUSE MANY *Devils were entered into him.* 3. *Jeſus* ſpoke to the *Commanding Officer* to come out; and all is repreſented by Mr. *Twells* as Obedience. But preſently the *numerous Rabble* begin to be obſtreperous. Not the *Commander* of the Legion, but the Soldiers, begin to mutiny and petition,---- THEY beſought him---- " But I forbear." How much more like a Man of Senſe does the Anthor of the *Reply* act, in attempting to remove the Difficulty ariſing from the Expreſſions, *Go out*, O unclean Spirit, when he

he allows a *Legion* of *Spirits* to be really in the Man? He tells us, that the Evangeliſts "ſometimes ſpeak of the *whole Body of* "*them collectively* in the ſingular Number, "and ſometimes *diſtinctly* in the Plural. In "like Manner, as God, ſpeaking to his Peo- "ple *Iſrael*, ſays, *Deut.* xii. 1. *Theſe are the* "*Statutes and Judgments which* YE *ſhall ob-* "*ſerve to do in the Land which the Lord* "*God of* THY *Fathers giveth* THEE. *It* "might as well be pretended, that this Paſ- "ſage is not to be underſtood literally, be- "cauſe the whole Army of *Iſrael* could not "be repreſented as *One Man.*" *p.* 71.

THE Anſwer to this is, That the Word *Spirit* is not in any Language a Name of Number, ſuch as Army, Nation, Aſſembly, *&c.* but is a general Term, which does not ſignify Plurality, juſt as *Man*, *Horſe*, &c. Where a Nation is ſpoke to, it may be addreſſed in its collective Body in the ſingular Number, and you may ſay to *Iſrael* as a Nation, *Thou*; or you may ſpeak to it as made up of Individuals in the Plural Number, *Ye*. To confute therefore the *Enquirer* in his Obſervation, an Inſtance ſhould have been produced where the Word, *Spirit*, ſignifies a collective Body of Spirits, and then poſſibly it might have been ſpoken to, either in the *Singular* or *Plural* Number. But this is impoſſible in any Language, to make the ſame

Word

Word ſignify an Individual, and a Collection of Individuals of the ſame Species. But allowing even this, this would not account for the Expreſſion, *Thou unclean Spirit*, when *unclean Spirits* were preſent; no more than, *Thou Nation* will be the ſame as *Ye Nations*, where *many Nations* are the Subjects of Diſcourſe. In Nouns of Number the Singular or Plural Pronouns may be uſed, and 'tis right to ſay, Come out, O Iſrael, *Thou* wicked *Nation*, or, *Ye* wicked *People:* But, O wicked Man, is but *One Man*; O unclean Spirit is but *One unclean Spirit*; and, *Ye* wicked *Spirit*, is as falſe Language as, *Ye* wicked *Man*, or, *Thou* unclean *Spirits*. But I proceed.

Now there was nigh unto the Mountains a great Herd of Swine feeding; and all the Devils beſought Jeſus, ſaying, Send us into the Swine, that we may enter into them; and forthwith Jeſus gave them leave. (St. *Luke*, *He ſuffered them.* St. *Matt.* *He ſaid unto them*, *Go.*) *And the unclean Spirits went out, and entered into the Swine, and the Herd ran violently down a ſteep Place into the Sea (they were about two thouſand) and were choaked in the Sea.* *Mark* v. 11, 12, 13. Theſe Words the *Impartial Writer* takes in the LITERAL Senſe, notwithſtanding the Difficulties that attend it. Some were propoſed by the *Enquirer* (*p.* 80, 81. of 2d *Enquiry*) and I beg leave to add, that

that it ſeems "highly incredible," and directly "oppoſite to our Saviour's Character," that he ſhould oblige the *Devils* in ſo *ſilly* and miſchievous a Requeſt; for they dwelt not long in the *Swine*, but having *poſſeſs'd* them, plung'd into the Sea, and then (I ſuppoſe) forſook their Bodies, and went the Lord knows whither. But the Senſe of theſe Verſes, according to the *Enquirer* (who ſeems deſirous of removing all Difficulties from the Scripture) is as follows.

THE *Legion* of *Devils (all the Devils)* is the mere Talk of the *Mad-man*, who conſidered as a *Jew*, and therefore an Enemy to Swine, might naturally deſire, upon ſeeing the Herd, that *Jeſus* would ſend his *Devils*, not out of the Country, but into the Swine; *and forthwith Jeſus ſaid Go*, humouring the *Mad-man*, as the beſt and wiſeſt Phyſician would have done in the like Caſe. It follows, that the Swine *ran* down a Precipice into the Sea; *i. e.* they were *drove* into the Sea, either by a Madneſs like to that of the Men under Cure, or by the Demoniacks themſelves. For 'tis plain the Swine would not of their own Accord have *ran* thither, and were therefore *driven*, either by the Diſeaſe of *Madneſs*, which might paſs from the *Mad-men* into the Swine, as the *Leproſy* of *Naaman* paſſed (2 *Kings* ii. 27.) *to* Gehazi, *and to his Seed for ever*. Or,

they were *driven* by the Mad-men when under Cure.

It will appear to any one that examines the Hiſtory of the Cures done by our Saviour on Demoniacks, that they were not cured the *very inſtant* the unclean Spirit was commanded out of them. Thus *Mark* ix. 25. after our Saviour had *rebuked the foul Spirit, ſaying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf Spirit, I charge thee come out of him, and enter no more into him.* The Spirit *cried and rent him ſore, and came out of him, and he was as one dead, inſomuch that many ſaid he is dead. And Jeſus took him by the Hand, and lifted him up, and he aroſe.* So again, *Mark* i. 25, 26. *Jeſus rebuked him, ſaying, Hold thy Peace, and come out of him. And when the unclean Spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud Voice, he came out of him.* In like manner it appears in the preſent Hiſtory, that *after* our Lord had ſaid to the Men, --- *Come out thou unclean Spirit,* --- many Things paſs'd which ſhew'd the Men not inſtantly *cured.* If during this Interval, that was done which the Enquirer *ſuppoſes* to be done, the whole may be conſiſtently accounted for. And perhaps it may deſerve a Thought, whether an inſtantaneous putting to rights the Solids and Fluids of a Human Body, which had long been ſubject to irregular Motions, would not create great Pain and Sickneſs to the diſtemper'd Perſon.

AGAINST the *firſt* Solution, *viz.* that the Diſeaſe of Madneſs paſs'd from the *Lunaticks* into the *Swine*, as *the Leproſy of* Naaman *did to* Gehazi *and his Seed.* I find it objected by the *Impartial Hand* (p. 40.) " That the Diſeaſe muſt have been the ſame " in Kind only; and then it muſt follow, " that when *Jeſus* had cured the Men of " the Diſorder of *Madneſs*, he inflicted the " ſame kind of Diſorder on the Swine; that " is, he made two Men ſober, and two " thouſand Hogs mad. And here it may " humbly be aſked, why ſhould *Jeſus* after " this Manner exert his divine Power? It " cannot be ſuppoſed, he did it on the Re- " queſt of the two *Mad-men.*"

BUT may not the ſame Difficulties be retorted on the Objector himſelf? It cannot be ſuppos'd, that CHRIST would gratify the *Devil*'s miſchievous Requeſt, no more than he would the Requeſt of *Mad-men:* And if the *Devils* paſſed from the *Demoniacks* into the Swine by a Licence from CHRIST, it muſt follow, in the Language of this Author, that " he made two Men ſober, and two " thouſand Hogs mad." --- As to the ſecond Solution, he " obſerves, *(p.* 42.) that 'tis " highly incredible that two Mad-men only " ſhould preſently frighten two thouſand of " ſuch STURDY Animals, and drive them " to their Deſtruction with as much Eaſe as

" if they had been a Flock of Sheep: It is " a great deal more probable, that if two, " or twice that Number of *Mad-men*, had " attempted to moleſt ſuch a vaſt Herd of " Swine, that they would have loſt their " *Madneſs* and their Lives together." How far ſuch an Action is credible or incredible, depends upon Circumſtances which are to be laid together: And as we certainly have but few given us by the Evangeliſts, we muſt ſupply others to account for the Fact. Thus much may be ſafely added, that any thing is more credible than Six or Four Thouſand (or what you pleaſe to be a *Legion* of) Devils driving two Thouſand Swine to Deſtruction.

St. *Luke* tells us, Chap. viii. 2. *Certain Women had been* healed *of evil Spirits, and Infirmities; Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went ſeven Devils* ---- " The probable " Meaning is (as the *Enquirer*, p. 57. ſup- " poſes) that ſhe had affirmed in her *Melan- " choly*, that ſhe had *ſo many Devils* in her, " juſt as the Mad-man ſaid he had *a Legion* " *of Devils* in him." To animadvert on this, is no little Pain to the *Impartial Hand*, (p. 45.) who ſays, " the *Enquirer* muſt have " had a new *Revelation* to know this." But there needs no " new Revelation," but only to underſtand the old one: And if to have a Demon means no more than to be *mad* or

epileptick

epileptick in other Places of Scripture, let us interpret this Paſſage by them. For it is not impoſſible, not unlikely, that *Mary Magdalen* might in one of her Fits " have affirmed " that ſhe had ſeven Devils, juſt as the *Mad-* " *man* ſaid he had a *Legion* of *Devils* in " him." But the *Impartial Hand* aſks, " Would the *Goſpel Hiſtorians* have gravely " told the World, that *ſeven Devils went* " *out* of her, when in truth there never " were *any in* her?" Which is the ſame as to aſk, Whether theſe *Hiſtorians* would write agreeable to the Language of their own Times? Which has been fully anſwered before.

THE laſt *Caſe* is that of the Damſel, *Acts* xvi. 16, 18. There was a *Damſel, poſſeſſed with a Spirit of Divination; which* (Damſel) *brought her Maſters much Gain by Southſaying: And this* did ſhe *many Days. But Paul being grieved, turned and ſaid to the Spirit, I command thee, in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, to come out of her. And he came out the ſame Hour.* Here is no mention of *Devil* or *Demon*, but of a *Spirit of Divination*; and what ſuch a Spirit is, this Writer does not inform us, which yet he ought to have done; but " thinks, without *more ado*, it is ſuffi- " cient to ſhew that the *Enquirer's Hypothe-* " *ſis* is indefenſible, if he lays before the " Reader how the *Enquirer* muſt interpret " the following Paſſages. St. *Paul* ſaith, *I*

" *command*

" *command thee in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt*
" *to come out of her.* Which with the *En-*
" *quirer* is, I command thee not to play the
" Trick any more. The Hiſtorian tells us,
" *The Spirit came out* of her *the ſame Hour.*
" That again with him muſt be, The Wo-
" man could not play the Trick any longer."
But what was this *Spirit* that came out of her? She is ſaid to have had πνέυμα πύθωνος, a *Spirit of Python*, i. e. She was a *Pythoneſs*, an *Ob*, ἐγγαστρίμυθος, a *Belly-Speaker*, One that can ſend forth Words out of the Belly, without moving the Lips. Several Perſons have had this Faculty in our own Times: And among the *Jews* and *Gentiles* too, as the *Enquirer* has ſhewn, ſuch People made Money of it, and pretended to do mighty Things. Now St. *Paul*, *grieving* to ſee Men impoſed on by this *Damſel*, *commands* the *Spirit to come out of her*; that is, not only commands *her* not to play the " Trick any
" more;" but *in the Name of Jeſus*, poſſibly wrought ſuch a Change in her, that ſhe was utterly unable to impoſe upon the People any more by her Art. And thus the following Queſtions are eaſily anſwered.----
" How by the *Apoſtle's Words* was a Stop
" put to the Trick? Did ſhe from that
" Time loſe the Art of ſpeaking inwardly?
" Or, was ſhe not willing, or, not able to
" ſpeak in the Manner ſhe did before; Or,

" did

" did St. *Paul*, by virtue of theſe Words, " make this profligate Cheat a Convert, and " an honeſt Woman? *&c.*

I cannot conclude, without taking notice of that extraordinary *Exclamation* againſt the *Enquirer* for " plucking *Laurels* from our " Saviour's Head;" for making " the Cauſe " of CHRIST to *ſuffer*;" for diminiſhing the *Value* of his Miracles; and (*p.* 64.) for " uſing the great Talents he is entruſted " with *to the Prejudice* of *his* Maſter's Inte- " reſt." ---- This is a heavy Charge, I muſt confeſs, but as *unjuſt* as it is *ſevere*. For if the learned and ingenious *Enquirer* has ſhewn the *true Meaning* of *Demoniacks in the New Teſtament*; if he has removed thoſe Difficulties which unavoidably attend the *received Notion* of them; if by his Hypotheſis, the Subject becomes free from " high Ridicule;" if Providence is by him defended againſt the Charge of *Cruelty*, *Confuſion*, and *Diſtreſs*: Why are theſe *bitter Invectives* thrown upon the Man? And why ſhould any Chriſtian thus *unjuſtly* revile his Brother? ---- Why is he ſaid to " hurt the Cauſe of CHRIST," when he protects it from *Ridicule*, and anſwers many *Difficulties* otherwiſe unſurmountable? And why is it called, " undermining his " Maſter's Intereſt," to propoſe an *Hypotheſis* which is conſiſtent with *natural Religion*; which vindicates the moral Attributes of GOD, his

his *great Mercy* and *Loving-kindneſs* to Men; and takes off from the *Devil*'s having an unneceſſary Share in the *Works* of *Providence?*

THIS puts me in mind of the Outcries which others likewiſe have been guilty of. Mr. *Hutchinſon* ſays in his Sermon, "If he "[the *Enquirer*] did not know that *Pompo-* "*natius*, *Vaninus*, *Hobbs*, *Spinoza*, and *Bek-* "*ker* eſpecially, had all patronized the ſame "Opinion, *&c.*" The Author of the *Reply to the Farther Enquiry*, *p.* 73. charges him with "joining the Cry of the Infidels, and "licking up the Spittle of *Woolſton.*" Mr. *Twells* too, ſeems to doubt the Author's *Sincerity*. If I may gueſs at the *Enquirer*'s Temper, I believe He had at any Time rather embrace the Truth, let who will teach it, than continue in an Error with the Multitude: That whether he did, or did not know, that thoſe Men had patronized the ſame Opinion, it was *impertinent* in Mr. *Hutchinſon* to talk in that Manner in a *Pulpit:* And that the *Impartial* Writer, Mr. *Hutchinſon*, Mr. *Twells*, and the other Gentleman, would not have hurt their reſpective Performances, had they avoided ſuch Reflexions, as are unworthy of Men, more unworthy of Chriſtians, and moſt unworthy of Preachers of that Goſpel, which teaches a Charity that *thinketh no Evil*, and *hopeth all Things*.

AN APPENDIX,

In ANSWER to

The Critical Diſſertation concerning the Words ΔΑΙΜΩΝ *and* ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟΝ.

THE preceding Sheets were in the Preſs, and part of them were printed off, before I ſaw or heard of *The Critical Diſſertation concerning the Words* Δαίμων *and* Δαιμόνιον. It is wrote with Candour, and Learning, and Ingenuity; and if I differ from the Author in ſome Things, he will certainly be able to ſhew my Miſtake.

HE begins with obſerving that the Word Δαίμων "is taken for the *Supreme Being*, "*the Divinity it ſelf*, ὁ Θεὸς, τὸ Θεῖον." And for Proof of this he refers to *Homer*, *Il.* P'. &c.

ON the contrary, Δαίμων is not taken in any of the Places refer'd to for ὁ Θεὸς, the *Supreme Being*, nor for τὸ Θεῖον. Cou'd *Homer* make *Menelaus* and *Ajax* able to fight the *Supreme Being*; whom He ſo often repreſents as ſuperior to all the Gods put together? and yet

Menelaus ſays ſo, in *Il.* P'. v. 104. *Julius Pollux*, l. i. c. 1. has obſerved, that "*Homer* "calls the Gods δαίμονας; and *Plato* called "the Governour of all things, *the greateſt* "*Demon*; and that τὸ Θεῖον and τὸ Δαιμόνιον "are uſed for the ſame thing." But Δαίμων is not put abſolute for ὁ Θεὸς, by *Homer*, nor *Plato*, nor I believe by any one elſe. Certain it is, that it is not ſo, in any one of the Places refer'd to. Much leſs is Δαίμων put for τὸ Θεῖον. *Ariſtotle*, in the Beginning of his Book *De Mundo*, ſays, "that Philo- "ſophy ſeemed to him to be Θεῖον τι καὶ "δαιμόνιον χρῆμα, *ſomething really divine and* "*more than human.*" But he does not ſay, that Δαίμων ſignifies τὸ Θεῖον; nor indeed could he ſay ſo with any more Propriety, than one can ſay that *Humanitas* in the Language of the Schools ſignifies *Homo*, or *Animalitas Animal.* And yet *This* is the Place refer'd to for this Senſe of the Word Δαίμων. So when *Plato* is refer'd to for the former Senſe of the Word, his Words are not Δαίμων, but μέγας Δαίμων, which is quite a different Thing.

P. 3. He ſays The Word, *Demon*, was very "frequently uſed to denote a Claſs of "Beings of a middle Nature betwixt the "Deity and Man." In Proof of this, *the moſt Antient Greek Authors* are propoſed to be mentioned, *p.* 4.

Heſiod,

Heſiod, ſays he, " makes thoſe happy MEN " who lived in the Golden Age AFTER " THEIR DEATHS to become *Demons*, and " looks upon them as the Guardians of Man- " kind. *Plato* from him adopts the *ſame* " Sentiments, and is followed by *other Wri-* " *ters* herein. Nay this laſt Author declares, " that every good and wiſe Man may be " called a Demon either before or after " DEATH." Here *Heſiod* is produced, in order to prove that the Word *Demon* denotes " Beings of a *middle* Claſs *betwixt* the Deity " and Man;" when he expreſly aſſerts them to be *Human Souls?* and ſpeaks not one Word of *middle Beings* diſtinct from *Human Souls.* This Author goes on thus ——

P. 4. " Though *Heſiod* honours the MEN " of the Golden Age with the Title of De- " mons *after their Deaths*, yet he does this " *chiefly* by way of *Compliment* to them, and " in order to excite his Brother *Perſes* to " imitate them, by performing *juſt* and *vir-* " *tuous* Actions. And therefore no certain " Concluſion can be drawn from hence with " regard to his real Opinion of the Nature " of Demons."

THE Point to be proved was, that *Heſiod* thought *Demons* not *Human Souls* departed, but middle Beings betwixt the Deity and Man. It was but in the preceding Page that he ſaid, " *Heſiod* makes thoſe happy MEN

" who lived in the Golden Age, *after their* " *Deaths* to become *Demons.*" Does this Author produce one Paſſage from *Heſiod*, to ſhew that His Demons were Beings of a middle Nature? Not one. Now, how does it appear, that *Heſiod* ſaid what he did " *chiefly* " by way of *Compliment* to the Men of the " Golden Age?" Or what does this Author mean by the Word CHIEFLY? That he incites his Brother *Perſes* (who was a lazy, idle, unjuſt Fellow) to Virtue and Induſtry, by telling him, that if he would be virtuous he ſhould become a *Demon*, is true. But when was *Perſes* to become a *Demon?* Was it not *after his Death?* Can there be a clearer Proof of *Heſiod*'s Notion of *Demons*, (that they once had been virtuous good *Men*) than this is, that if *Perſes* would be virtuous he ſhould become a *Demon* too?

NOW ſuppoſing *Heſiod*'s Notion to have been, that Demons were *Middle Beings* betwixt the Deity and Man: How would *Perſes* become a *Demon* by living virtuouſly? If Human Souls become *Demons*, all is intelligible: Or if Human Souls, by an Advancement in Goodneſs, become in Proceſs of Time, as ſome maintain'd, *Demons*; then too *Heſiod* is plain. But as he reckons *Human Souls* of the golden Age to be *Demons*, and ſpeaks of none elſe, it may ſeem ſurprizing that *Heſiod* ſhould be produced as an Evi-

dence

dence for what he has never ſpoke one Word about.

THIS Author proceeds, " He [*Heſiod*] " makes a Diſtinction betwixt *the bleſſed and* " *immortal Gods* who are *Homer*'s Demons, " and the *departed* Worthies of the Golden " Age, who are *his* [*Heſiod*'s] *Demons.*" ibid.

Is not this confeſſing the *departed* Worthies of the Golden Age to be *Heſiod*'s Demons? *i. e.* Human Souls?

THE very next Words are, " He makes " THEM, *viz. Homer*'s Gods and his own " Demons, different and diſtinct Claſſes of " Beings; and conſequently it cannot be in- " fer'd from him ---- that *all Demons*, or " even the Beings to whom this Word was " firſt applied, were *Ghoſts*, or Spirits of *de-* " *parted Men.*" ibid.

Heſiod's Demons confeſſedly, in the very laſt Citation, were " the *departed* Worthies " of the Golden Age." In theſe Words which immediately follow, He [*Heſiod*] makes THEM different and diſtinct Claſſes of Beings: *i. e.* He makes *the Bleſſed and Immortal Gods* of a diſtinct Claſs from *Demons.* Admitting this: The Point is, to prove *Demons*, and *the Spirits of departed* MEN to be different in *Heſiod*'s Opinion; and here 'tis aſſerted, that GODS [not *Men*] and Demons were different. What ſort of Proof is this?

THE

THE next Argument is, *p.* 5. That Demons are *knowing Beings* by way of Eminence: "Beings endued with Knowledge "only, without relation to any other Quality, Circumſtance and Perfection ---- Beings endued with a Degree of Knowledge "ſuperior to what WE enjoy." Therefore they were not in *Heſiod*'s Opinion Spirits of departed Men.

'TIS ſufficient to Anſwer: 1*ſt*, That *Heſiod* tells us, as is own'd by this Author, that they *were* in fact the Souls of departed Men. And 2*dly*, It may be ſuppoſed, that Souls departed are enlarged, and may be greatly improved in Knowledge; and muſt be ſo to execute the Offices aſſign'd them by *Heſiod*. This therefore will not prove, what it is brought to prove, That *Heſiod* made Demons a different and diſtinct Claſs of Beings from the Souls of Men.

HE goes on; "*Heſiod* calls his Demons "*good and terreſtrial*, which ſeems to inſinuate that there were *other* Demons who "were neither *good* nor *terreſtrial*." Which is juſt ſuch Reaſoning as this: He calls the Gods, *bleſſed and immortal*; therefore there are *other* Gods who are neither *bleſſed* nor *immortal*. He calls *Men*, θνητοὶ, *mortal*; which ſeems to inſinuate, that there are other *Men* who were not mortal.

HITHERTO

HITHERTO we have no Inſtance produced from *remote Antiquity*, of Demons being a diſtinct Claſs of Beings. This Author proves indeed very well, that the ancient *Perſians*, *Chaldeans*, *Egyptians*, and from them the *Greeks*, had a Notion of an *Evil Principle*, called *Hades*, *Arimanius*, *Ahâriman*, *Typhon*: But the Point is, to produce ſome ancient Writer for Evidence of a Notion among them of a diſtinct Claſs of *bad Demons*, "inſtigating and tempting Men to all kinds "of Wickedneſs and Sin, and afterwards "becoming Inſtruments of their Puniſh-"ment." p. 7. *Plutarch* is not early enough, nor *Iamblichus*, nor *Hierocles*: Nor is *Their* Saying that ſuch was an *ancient Opinion*, without Vouchers, any Proof. 'Tis very odd, that in ſo remarkable a Notion, there ſhould not be any Remains left, no Sentence of the old Philoſophers, or Poets, or Hiſtorians, (which are voluminous enough, and ſpeak very often of Demons and their Offices:) it ſeems I ſay very ſtrange, that no Inſtance can be produced from the Antients of *Evil Demons*, to whom ſuch part was attributed, as was aſſigned them afterwards by Writers of much later Ages.

BUT as this learned Author has attempted to ſhew this in his *Critical Diſſertation*, it will be worth while to examine what he has offered. He begins thus:

Δαίμων,

Δαίμων, he ſays, ſignifies " a *created in-*
" *telligent Being* ſuperior *to* Man; (for that
" *Heſiod*'s Demons were *made* or *created* by
" the Gods he plainly aſſerts) and all ſuch
" Beings as theſe were, from *the remoteſt An-*
" *tiquity*, thrown into *two different Claſſes*."

I MUST ſtill aſk, Were *Heſiod*'s Demons " created Beings *ſuperior* to *Man?*" That they were *created*, or *made*, by the Gods, is plain from the Place refer'd to in *Heſiod*, viz. v. 110. But then in the very Line before that, they are expreſly called *the golden Generation*, Ἀνθρώπων, of MEN. And he tells How and When they lived on Earth, and that they *died* as if they had only *fallen aſleep*, and how they became *Demons*. 2. I think I may aſk, whether *Heſiod* and *Homer* make a part of this *remoteſt Antiquity?* And did either of theſe, or did *Plato*, divide theſe Beings into *Two different Claſſes?* If they did, the Paſſages may with Eaſe be produced, where they told us of *Demons* that were, as this Author deſcribes them, " implacable, " had an invincible Averſion to Men, and " made it their Buſineſs to defeat them in " all their good Purpoſes, to influence and " perſuade them to what was wrong, and in " ſhort to draw them to Deſtruction." *p.* 11.

Heſiod's Notion has been ſufficiently conſider'd. Let us next examine *Homer*, who is affirmed *to mention Both of them*, i. e. Both

Good

Good and *Evil Demons*, p. 12. For this, *Il.* Θ. v. 166. is cited. Now here *Hector* threatens *Diomedes*, τοι δαίμονα δώσω, that *he would give him* δαίμονα, *viz.* his Death. Does δαίμονα here ſignify any Being that was intelligent, or created, or *benevolent*, or *malignant*? *Il.* O. v. 403. σὺν δαίμονι, is indeed *favente Demone*, or, *Deo*, and implies *Benevolence*. Il. P'. v. 98, 104. is ſomewhat harder. *Menelaus* ſays,

Ὁππότ' ἀνὴρ ἐθέλει πρὸς δαίμονα φωτὶ μάχεσθαι
Ὅν κε θεὸς τιμᾷ, τάχα οἵ μέγα πῆμα κυλίσθη.

Here the *Scholiaſt* ſays, πρὸς ſignifies παρά; and that the Senſe is, παρὰ τὴν γνώμην τοῦ θεοῦ; *abſurdly*. The Meaning ſeems to be, *Whoever fights with a Man who has a God* preſent *with him, he'll greatly ſuffer*. Here likewiſe benevolent Aſſiſtance is implied; but then it was ſuch benevolent Aſſiſtance that *Menelaus* thought, that if he could find out *Ajax*, They Two might engage *Hector*, even πρὸς δαίμονα περ, notwithſtanding the Demon that aſſiſted him. Nor muſt the Aſſiſtance given to *Hector* by a Demon be interpreted, as if the Good Demon to *Hector* was an Evil Demon to *Menelaus*, any more than the Favour of God to one Man, and the Diſappointments of Providence to another, muſt make God himſelf be look'd upon or treated as an *Evil* Being to him who is ſo diſappointed.

He goes on; "To the Evil Demon he "[*Homer*] joins the Epithets κακὸς, συγερὸς, "and χαλεπὸς; and even the Word Δαίμων "itſelf, without any of theſe, he uſes in a "*bad* Signification." *p.* 12.

Does this Author mean by, "a *bad* "Signification," Evil Demons, ſuch as he has defined *Evil Demons* to be? His only Evidence produced for this is, the Verſe before mentioned, where *Hector* threatens *Diomedes* to *give him* Δαίμονα, *Death*. Could *Hector give Diomedes* an *Evil Being*? Or what is δαίμονα in that Place to the preſent Purpoſe? Where the Epithets κακὸς, συγερὸς, and χαλεπὸς, are uſed, there is no Relation to *Evil Beings*, "implacable, influencing Men to "*wrong*;" but they were *Good Beings*, as *Homer*'s Demons all are, hindering indeed Men by providential Means from obtaining their Deſigns; but not Devils, malignant, malevolent Beings.

What is ſaid from *Pindar* is fully conſidered above, *p.* 12. and the Scholiaſt here produced by this Author is a full Evidence that *Pindar* meant, *The* κακοποιὸς, *Evil Principle*, as oppoſed to *The* ἀγαθοποιὸν, *Good One*. *Callimachus* is likewiſe ſhewn to mean the ſame evil Principle, *p.* 14, 15. and conſequently they are no Evidences of *Evil Demons*.

The next Authority produced is *Menander*, in proof of the Notion of *Evil Demons*; which

which is very remarkable, ſince *Menander*'s Verſes are ſtill extant, and he is ſpeaking of *Good* Demons in Terms expreſs, and cautions us to think that there are any *Evil* Demons.

Ἅπαντι δαίμων ἀνδρὶ συμπαρίσταται
Εὐθὺς γιγνομένῳ μυσταγωγὸς τοῦ βίου
Ἀγαθὸς κακὸν γὰρ δαίμον' οὐ νομιστέον
Εἶναι, βίον βλάπτοντα χρηστόν. ——
—— ἅπαντα δ' ἀγαθὸν εἶναι θεόν.

Of this ſee above, *p.* 18.

Empedocles's Demons are ſpoken to before, *p.* 19. 37.

Plautus, in the Paſſage cited, is ſpeaking not of any Evil Demon, --- *Teneo dextra* Genium *meum*. *Men. Act.* 1. *Sc.* 2. *v.* 29.

Herodotus is likewiſe cited by the Author of the *Critical Diſſertation*, *p.* 16, 17. to prove a Notion of Evil Demons (ſuch, I ſuppoſe, as are defined before, "Beings implacable, which had an invincible Averſion to Men, and made it their Buſineſs--- to influence and perſuade them to what was wrong.") All the Proof produced from *Herodotus* is, that he has uſed the Word, κακοδαιμονίη; which ſignifying *Ill Fortune*, *Ill Fate*, is no Evidence of what it is produced for. And even ſuppoſing *Ill Fortune* to be cauſed ſometimes by *Demons*, this would not prove ſo much as the Exiſtence of ſuch Beings as are here deſcribed; ſince Good Demons may prevent Succeſs, or it

may not be right in the whole, that even good Men ſhould always be attended with Proſperity.

'Twill be needneſs to examine whether the *Latin* Word *Genius* comes from the *Arabick Gjin*, or *Gian*, which I do not think to be probable, however ingenious the Conjecture may be; but it is of ſome moment to obſerve, that this ſame *Arabick* Word *Gjin*, which ſignifies a *Demon*, ſignifies *Madneſs*: and *Magjnun*, which ſignifies *Demone obſeſſus*, is uſed for *inſanus*, *furens*, *maniacus*. v. *Caſtel. Lex. Polyg.*

The Author of the *Enquiry* had aſſerted, that *at the Beginning*, and in their *Origin*, in the *remoteſt Antiquity*, Demons were *Human Souls*, and nothing elſe. Afterwards they were ſuppoſed to be a diſtinct Sort of middle Beings: But even then, none of them were ſuppoſed to be *Devils*, i. e. "to have an invincible Averſion to Men, and to make it "their Buſineſs to defeat them in all their "good Purſuits, to influence and perſuade "them to what is wrong, and, in ſhort, to "draw them to Deſtruction." Nor has this learned Author produced ſo much as *one* Inſtance of ſuch a Notion. The *Enquirer* made ſome uſe of the Account he gave of the *Origin* of the Notion of *Demons*, in explaining many Paſſages of the Old Teſtament, conſiſtent with the known Idolatry of very antient Times, which conſiſted in the Deification of Men;

Men; an Idolatry that was in the World as early at leaſt as the Worſhip of the *Sun* and *Stars*; and perhaps it is the firſt mentioned in Hiſtory, if *Laban*'s Gods were Images of ſome *deified Perſon*, as I think moſt probable.

THIS learned Author thinks, that he has brought a *Demonſtration*, that *Demons* in the New Teſtament ſignify "*Devils*, ſtrictly and "and properly ſo called." And this is founded upon a Proof that "*Beelzebub*, *Satan*, and "*Devil*, are different Names only of the "ſame Being." *p.* 22---25. To explain a Paſſage, which I have not met with explained ſatisfactorily by any of our Commentators, let it be obſerved,

1. ALL that the *Phariſees* could poſſibly know of *Beelzebub* was, that he was properly a *Demon*. He was *the God of Ekron*. vid. 2 *Kings*, ch. i. the only Place where he is mentioned in the Old Teſtament.

2. *Beelzebub*, from his Name in *Hebrew*, is commonly ſuppoſed to be the ſame as μυίαγρος, ἀπομύιος, the God of *Flies*, the *Catcher*, or *Driver away of Flies*. Juſt like *Apollo* σμίνθος. Such were *leſſer* Deities; and conſequently, had *Beelzebub* had his Name from ſuch a Cauſe, he would not have been called, *Prince of* Demons, ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων.

3. SHOULD I attempt to account for this *Title*, and not ſucceed to the full Satisfaction of the Learned, they will forgive a probable Conjecture;

Conjecture; when it is obſerved, that none of our Commentators attempt to account for it; and the Great *Selden* ſays,----*Ob quam rem ad principem Demoniorum denotandum uſurpetur* Beelzebub, *aut* Beelzebul *(dum tamen innuebant* Beelzebub) *fateor cum* Origine, *me omnino latere. Selden* de *Diis Syr.* Therefore,

4. I conceive that *Beelzebub*, was not the *God of Flies*, but was deemed the *God of Fruitfulneſs*, and had his Name from *thence*; and was repreſented accordingly. He was not a petty *Fly-catching*, or *Fly-averting* God, but a *great* Demon, the Author or Promoter of *Fecundity*. *Zab*, *Zabab*, *Zebub*, in *Arabick*, ſignify the Part adapted to Generation; and *Zab* ſignifies likewiſe a *fruitful Field*. Thus will *Beelzebub* be in *Ekron*, what *Bacchus*, *Oſiris*, &c. were elſewhere. *Herodotus*, *Diodorus*, and many others, in giving an Account of the *Egyptian* Religious Proceſſions, and what they carried about in them, will greatly confirm this Account.

HENCE may be gathered a Reaſon, why *Ahaziah*, who was *childleſs*, 2 *Kings* i. 17. ſent to conſult *Beelzebub the God of* Ekron, rather than any other Demon.

THESE Things being premiſed---The Charge of the *Phariſees* againſt our Saviour was, that He *caſt out* Demons *by* Beelzebub, Prince of Demons, ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων. No: replied our Lord,---*Every Kingdom, Houſe, City, divided againſt itſelf, ſhall not ſtand. Beelzebub* can't be my Aſſiſtant, nor can I be in Confederacy with Him, ſince my Deſign is to root out all *Idolatry*. *And* if Satan *be divided againſt himſelf, how ſhall* HIS *Kingdom ſtand?* Our Saviour makes a Tranſition natural and eaſy from *Beelzebub* (who was an Idol, tho' reckoned

reckoned a Superior Demon) to *Satan*, who is ever repreſented as King of that univerſal Kingdom, in which Wickedneſs, and a Revolt from GOD, were conſpicuous: And he argues, That as he could not be in Confederacy with *Beelzebub*, ſo neither could he be with *Satan*, to do what he did in order to promote the Kingdom of GOD; but that he did it all *by the Spirit of God*. Thus the Argument proceeds regularly: And our Saviour does not ſay, that *Satan* is the ſame as *Beelzebub*, nor is *Beelzebub* the ſame as *Devil*; nor indeed could the God of *Ekron* be repreſented (tho' he was imagined to be Superior to many other Demons) as the ſame with *Satan*, who is repreſented as *Princeps hujus mali Generis*, vid. *Tertull. Apol.* c. xxii. Nor do the *Jews* make *Beelzebub*, the *Prince of Devils*, or call him ſo in their Writings, but *Aſhmodeus*, or *Samael*. vid. *Selden*, ubi ſupra. I ſhall conclude with theſe Propoſitions.

1. IT does not appear, that in the *Heathen* World, any of them, by the Word Δαίμονες, ever denotes "intelligent Beings of a moſt ma-"lignant, noxious, and accurſed Nature, tempt-"ing and enticing Men to Evil, in order to "Deſtruction."

2. THAT the Language about *Demons*, and their Operations upon Men, was *formed* when no *Evil* Demons were ever proved to exiſt.

3. THAT Perſons were ſuppoſed to be poſſeſſed by *Spectres*, *Hobgoblins*, *Larvæ*, *Ceres*, &c. who in fact had no Exiſtence, or no Power over Men; and yet the Language was ſuch as *ſeem'd* to imply that thoſe *imaginary Beings* did poſſeſs Men.

4. THAT the New Teſtament ſpeaking of Demons as *poſſeſſing* Men, ſpeaks in Words of common Uſe, and in the common vulgar Notions,

not

not concerning itself in strict *Philosophical Speculations*.

5. THAT Possession by *Devils*, being granted to be *believed* by People, it does not follow that he that cures Distempers supposed to be owing to that Cause, and that *speaks* as such People speak, *i. e.* that uses Words in common Language, must certainly admit as Truth *That Philosophical* Speculation, which the ignorant People imagine to be true.

6. SUPPOSING that the *Jews*, and *Gentiles* too, commonly believed that a Variety of Distempers were owing to the Influence of *Evil* Beings; yet their *Belief* is no Proof or Evidence of the *Fact*. But it must be *proved* by other Topicks, that *Evil Beings* did in fact possess Men.

7. IN the *Enquiry* many Instances are produced of Persons said to be possessed by Spirits, and likewise many Instances of *Language* formed upon that Supposition, when yet not one of those Persons were *in fact* possess'd by any Spirit whatever. Therefore,

LASTLY, Allowing the Author of this *Dissertation* to have proved all that he has attempted about the Meaning of the Word Δαίμων; and admitting that some *Demons* were deemed *Evil Beings* by some Antients; yet he has still to prove, not only that the Operations of these mischievous Beings upon Men, are agreeable to "the general Sense of Mankind in *all* Ages," which is impossible to be done for want of History; but that they are true *in fact*, in *any* Age before CHRIST; which will be enough to satisfy the *Enquirer*.

F I N I S.

Erratum. Page 37. for σκυθρόπως, *Laertius*. read σκυθρωπὸς, vid. *Laertius*.